MODULE 1

MODELS OF CONVERSATION AND NARRATIVE

TOWARDS A PEDAGOGIC DESCRIPTION

by

PATRICK JAMES KIERNAN

SUPERVISOR: CARMEN ROSA CALDAS-COULTHARD

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Arts
of the University of Birmingham
in part fulfilment of the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ABSTRACT

This is the first of three modules concerned with narrative and identity in English language teaching in Japan. This module makes the case for developing a pedagogical model of spoken discourse, particularly spoken narrative, to aid the teaching of English in foreign language contexts such as Japan. It is proposed that this model should take account of the learners L1, in this case Japanese. Rather than teaching the model, however, it is suggested that the model would ideally be applied using a task-based approach.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND AIMS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

APPENDIX I: LEARNER NARRATIVES

TRANSCRIPT CONVENTIONS

.	indicates falling intonation at the end of an utterance
…	additional dots indicate extended pauses
,	indicates a falling intonation followed by a pause
?	indicates a rising intonation
??	indicates exaggerated rising intonation
!	indicates emphasis, usually slightly louder
"…"	speech marks are used to indicate reported speech (sometimes performed in a different voice.
{…}	used to give evaluative comments on the transcript such as tone of voice
[	where speakers overlap this indicates the start point of the overlap
=	indicates immediate continuance by the following speaker but no whole word overlap.

Short utterances are followed by a line break with no comma at the end. Utterances which last more than one line have a comma the end of the line to show that the utterance is not complete.

Additional conventions for Japanese transcript

That	subscript used to give literal English meaning of the words
[…]	used to refer to identify grammatical markers which tag or provide endings to the immediately preceding word

The Japanese transcript was prepared by the author but checked by a Japanese native speaker.

Where material is quoted from other authors the original transcript conventions are used and differences are explained in a note at the bottom of the page.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1   In a nutshell

The motivation for this module began with a problem in the classroom: How can conversation models for EFL learners, such as those in Japan, be improved? It is argued here that, despite many improvements in EFL conversation teaching, pedagogic models of conversation fail to reflect developments in conversational description in discourse analysis (DA) (Brown & Yule, 1983a; Coulthard, 1985; 1992; Gumperz, 1982; Schiffrin, 1988; Stubbs, 1983; Tsui, 1994) and conversation analysis (CA) (Eggins and Slade, 1997; Sacks 1995; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974[1]). Although these studies approach conversation from a variety of perspectives they are testimony against the folk wisdom that spoken language is simply a disorganised version of the written word. Moreover it has been proposed that everyday conversation, far from orienting towards the production of grammatical sentences, is structured in accordance with the communicative needs of the moment (Brazil, 1995; Carter and McCarthy, 1995). If this is the case it may be doing learners a disservice to insist that they produce correct grammatical sentences. Textbook models built around pedagogical grammar may not be very helpful either. Instead EFL teachers, and perhaps learners too, might benefit from some guidance on communicative language use, rather than simply focusing on sentence mechanics. Teachers have no doubt always given some advice on conversational usage, and some concrete pedagogic recommendations for applying

---

[1] For a summary of recent developments in Conversation Analysis see Hutchby & Wooffit、1998; or Markee, 2000.

discourse approaches to the classroom have been made (Brown and Yule, 1983b; Celce-Murcia and Olshtain, 2000; Cheetham, 1998; Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1994; McCarthy, 1991; McCarthy & Carter, 1995). Further evaluation of these proposals is still needed, but some success in teaching pragmatics to EFL learners gives reason for optimism (Kasper, 2001; Rose and Kasper, 2001). Also of interest in this respect, are some recent classroom research projects where the teacher researcher designed materials to raise learner awareness of particular features of conversation described in the theoretical literature. Kenny (2002) used Channell (1994), and Overstreet (2000) as sources of information about interpersonal markers to introduce to learners; Lucantonio (2002) developed materials to raise learner awareness of narrative genre in conversation based on Eggins and Slade (1997) and Paltridge (2001); and Blight (2002) used consciousness-raising activities to introduce learners to Grice's (1975) Maxims, as groundwork for developing learners' pragmatic awareness of using language in cross-cultural settings. While these projects illustrate how a little resourcefulness can bring descriptive linguistic research into the classroom, they are also a sign that there is a demand for more theoretical research into conversation aimed at developing pedagogy. In the absence of such a framework, or perhaps because not enough of the research that has been done has been directed at improving models of spoken language for EFL learners, teachers and materials designers continue to rely on a mix of pedagogic grammar and personal intuition. There is still no established model of communicative usage for pedagogy, but perhaps the time is now ripe for the development of one.

1.2   Outline

The discussion in this module is divided into five chapters. This chapter introduces the

general aims of the research, and offers an outline of the module. Chapter 2 discusses the   need for a pedagogic model of conversation, reviews some of the progress that has been made in conversational pedagogy and description, and assesses the potential relevance of developments in spoken DA and CA. Chapter 3 extends this discussion by reviewing models of conversational narrative. While Labov and Waletzky's (1967) description of oral narrative remains an important starting point for the analysis of the more prototypical narratives, researchers who have focused on narrative as it occurs in everyday conversation (Eggins and Slade, 1997; Ervin-Tripp and Küntay, 1997; Norrick, 2000; Ochs & Capps, 2001), argue for a broader definition of narrative which embraces a range of narrative types and allows for the creation of narratives by multiple speakers. A comparative study of spoken narratives in Japanese and English should perhaps consider both approaches, and seems likely to lead to further redefinition of narrative. The practical and methodological problems associated with narrative analysis are also discussed. Chapter 4 takes an initial look at some learner narratives and begins to consider both how narrative tasks can be developed to make them more authentic and what can be learned about L1 narrative norms by analysing them. The narratives derive from an initial recording of EFL learners at a Japanese university, doing narrative tasks. After introducing learners to narrative through tasks learners were asked to first write a personal narrative at home to give them time to compose it, then tell it to a partner. The telling was repeated in L1 to provide some comparative data. In future modules it may also be useful to make a four-way comparison between written and spoken forms as well as Japanese and English. The final chapter, Chapter 5, reviews the discussion in this module and outlines a direction for further research. It concludes by suggesting that in addition to an ongoing investigation of narrative tasks, spoken narratives outside the

classroom, but not necessarily outside Japan need to be studied. In addition to making narrative tasks more authentic and learner centred, conversational pedagogy needs to be able to develop consciousness-raising tasks based on a naturalistic description of language. Rather than artificially import data from 'native' English speaking countries, a more meaningful comparison might be made by looking at Japanese conversational narratives and English ones found in Japan. Data sources might include English language radio and television, as well as recordings of native English speakers living in Japan. Such an approach would also be in harmony with a philosophy of EFL teaching which encourages learners to express themselves in English as a global *lingua franca* rather than attempting to feed learners the English language packaged as an ideological bundle of an inner circle (Crystal, 1997: 54) English speaking culture such as Britain or the United States.

CHAPTER 2

CONVERSATIONAL DESCRIPTION AND EFL

...direct teaching of concepts is impossible and fruitless. A teacher who tries to do this usually accomplishes nothing but empty verbalism, a parrotlike repetition of words... (Vygotsky, 1986: 150)

2.1   A return to form

An important issue for any approach to language teaching is to decide on the role that form will play in the classroom. Whereas grammar based approaches are built around a focus on form, communicative approaches have tended to downplay the role of form. Perhaps the most extreme and influential move away from a focus on form is Krashen and Terrell's *Natural Approach* (1988; Krashen, 1987) which suggests that a focus on form has no direct effect on language acquisition, and therefore should not be an important part of language teaching. This proposal was based on studies like Bailey et al (1974) and Christison (1979) who found that adult second language learners followed the same acquisition sequence of grammatical morphemes as children learning their first language (Brown, 1973). In response to this Krashen and Terrell (1988) posit a theory of language acquisition in which 'we acquire by "going for meaning" first and as a result, we acquire structure!' (Krashen, 1987: 21). The language teacher's function is simply to provide appropriate language input (and presumably feedback on the learner's own utterances), much as sympathetic 'foreigner talk' supposedly does. However research into SLA in the classroom has continued, and a number of more recent studies indicate that form-focused teaching may indeed be a very important part of language learning for

adults (Ellis, 2001; Doughty and Williams, 1998; Doughty, 2001). For one thing it has been shown that immersion in the target language is not a sufficient condition for complete acquisition of a language by second language learners (Swain, 1998). More importantly an increasing body of studies testify to the effect of form focus on learning (Day and Shapson, 2001; Norris and Ortega, 2001; Williams & Evans, 1998). DeKeyser (1998) remarks that the question is no longer whether to focus on form but 'What forms should students be made to focus on – and how and when.' (ibid, 42). Broadly speaking, as Ellis sums it up (2001: 17-26), three approaches to form teaching have been proposed. 1. *focus-on-forms* which orients towards the learner's discovery of a rule either inductively or through explicit instruction; 2. *planned focus-on-form* which targets specific forms through enriched language input or communicative tasks, while the learner's attention is focused on meaning; and 3. *incidental focus on form* which uses various forms of feedback in a communicative setting to focus on form. Meanwhile the question of 'what forms?' is in need of further consideration within a broader context.

The above mentioned studies were carried out with French second language (FSL) learners in Canada, where long-term immersion programs ensure a high level of communicative competence. I would now like to reconsider the question of 'what forms?' in a quite different context; that of EFL learners in Japan for whom communicative competence is itself an elusive goal. Japanese learners learn English as a foreign language and typically have little opportunity to use it outside the classroom until they have to make that all important trip abroad. By the time they enter university they are expected to have studied a battery of syntactic patterns which are tested throughout high school and in university entrance exams, and other public examinations,

but are unlikely to have come across interpersonal markers like 'you know' or 'I mean' even though they are extremely common in conversational speech (McCarthy & Carter, 1997: 25). At the same time many young Japanese people seem to have picked up a limited repertoire of expressive phrases such as 'oh my God' from imported TV and movies which they use indiscriminately. The reasons for Japanese learners' great difficulty with English are both linguistic and educational. The following sections summarise these problems.

2.2   The *furoshiki* and the suitcase

> *[the Japanese sentence is like a Japanese <u>furoshiki</u>] that marvelous carryall kerchief which will expand or contract to just the size needed…The English sentence, on the other hand, is like the unwieldy suitcase of the West—too big and too small at the same time*
>
> (Martin, 1975: 35)

French and English are closely related languages (Baugh & Cable, 1978) and cultural differences between L1 French Canadians and L1 English Canadians must be minimal, so that a narrow focus on syntactic form may be justified. By contrast the Japanese language not only has a different orthography, intonation, syllabary, and syntactic structure, no articles nor any distinction between singular and plural, but is also organized around different social and pragmatic norms (Martin, 1975; Obana, 2000). Indeed a whole genre—Japanology—has developed to contrast Japan with the West, culturally as well as linguistically (Benedict, 1954; Martin, 1975; Nakane, 1973).

7

However this poetic tendency to see Japan as a mirror of Western values has inevitably led to some exaggeration. This is gradually giving way to more disciplined research into comparative linguistic description which recognizes the importance of fundamental similarities as well as difference (e.g. Tanaka, 1999; Furo, 2001). Some of the differences in conversational organization between Japanese and English that have been most discussed include the following:

1) Due to the use of particle markers, and a basic 'topic-comment' organisation basic word order (e.g. English SVO; Japanese SOV) Japanese is much more flexible. (Obana, 2000)

2) Patterns of ellipsis are quite different from English and indeed extremely common. A single uninflected verb '*aishiteru*' normally stands for 'I love you'. In conversational narratives, where English uses pronominal substitution Japanese may well omit the agent altogether (Clancy, 1980). Indeed Japanese has rules for nominal, verbal, particle and even clause ellipses (Hinds, 1982) which make English seem a comparatively inflexible language (Martin, 1975).

3) Japanese employs a system of humble and honorific forms in accordance with a person's social relation to the speaker. Although this is partly a matter of social hierarchy, it is more important to distinguish between *uchi* 'insiders' and *soto* 'outsiders'. Hence a Japanese clerk talking to someone from outside his company, should use humble forms to refer to his own organisation's president, because the president belongs to the same company and is therefore an insider. However if the clerk addressed his company president directly he would use honorific forms to refer to the president, because the clerk is of a lower social status (Obana, 2000). It

is sometimes said that young Japanese people, when they first start work, find it difficult to refer to their seniors using humble forms when talking to customers on the telephone, especially if the person they are referring to is sat nearby.

4) Some studies have also focused on interpersonal listening sounds (or *aizuchi*) which have generally been observed as occurring more frequently in Japanese than American English (LoCastro, 1987; Maynard 1990). It has also been suggested that change of speaker transition relevance places (TRP) (Sacks et al, 1974) can be characterised as corresponding with pragmatic <u>and</u> syntactic completion in English, whereas in Japanese pragmatic completion (and TRP) does not always correspond with syntactic completion (Tanaka, 1999).

Although not all of these features are agreed they are areas of difference that have implications for Japanese learners of English. While prominent linguistic differences may feature in Japanese courses aimed at English native speakers, the Japanese learner's linguistic and cultural background is generally given no more than token consideration in EFL texts which in any case seek to capture a world market. While some Japanese materials take a comparative approach the scope is generally limited to syntactic contrasts.

2.3   Going 'Communicative'

As well as linguistic differences, Japanese learners are handicapped by an English education system which in spite of a will to overhaul its outdated grammar translation method, has been hampered in putting a more communicative approach into practice. Japanese English education, particularly at high school level, is at present stuck between

a wish to embrace a communicative approach to language teaching and the 'washback' effects created by university entrance examinations which test students' knowledge of pedagogic grammar (Himbury, 2001). The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (hereafter *Monbusho*) (Monbusho, 1992) has redefined the aims of English education in schools, in terms of encouraging communicative ability and international understanding. Practical steps to implement this include the Japanese English Teachers (JET) program which brings native teachers to work alongside Japanese English language teachers in schools throughout Japan, and even training Japanese English teachers at the University of Birmingham (Sato, 2002). However, these top-down initiatives seem to have been partially nullified by the conservative culture of schools (Sato, ibid; Wada, 2000), and the *Monbusho's* own failure to revise its description of the English language. The recommendations for grammar structures and vocabulary to be learned in each year of junior high and high school have been relaxed (Wada, ibid) but not revised to include important conversational vocabulary or any guidance on features of conversational organisation. The main reason for this must partly be that there is no established pedagogical description of conversational discourse available.

Nevertheless the development of effective classroom practices based on a sound theoretical foundation have helped make the communicative approach increasingly attractive to many involved with English education worldwide. General notions of developing 'communicative competence' (Hymes, 1972) or 'learning by going for meaning' (Krashen, 1987: 21) have been translated into concrete classroom techniques such as activities involving role play (Di Pietro, 1987), and language tasks designed to

be completed through an exchange of information (Skehan, 1996; 1998). Not only do well designed tasks give learners a focus for speaking, but they demand some of the skills required to communicate effectively in a foreign language, such as clarification and negotiation of meaning. Furthermore, the importance of grammar and vocabulary becomes relative to the effectiveness (or otherwise) of the communicative act, rather than text book correctness.

However despite the overall acceptance of a communicative approach in principle and the effectiveness of communicative techniques such as task based learning, CLT has failed to develop a pedagogic model of conversation. The changes brought about in language teaching within a communicative framework might be described as a paradigmatic shift (Woodward, 1996), however the move from grammar-translation to CLT has so far been a change that is closely related to theories of language acquisition, and the way languages are learned, rather than how language itself is organised. Within language pedagogy, at least, the communicative approach has not extended to models of language itself. As a result where there is a need to refer to language structure, teachers have little choice but to fall back on pedagogic grammar, or personal intuitions about language, which may not be as reliable as is often assumed (Wolfson, 1982b). In other words, when it comes to language structure the communicative approach has to piggy-back on traditional models. In practice 'communicative' EFL texts are typically organised in terms of themes or functions, however these are carefully selected to blend with the same structures that have always been highlighted in student grammars. While this is no doubt done in the spirit of eclecticism, it reinforces the idea that communicative purpose and grammatical form are identical. This may be regarded as an

acceptable simplification for beginners but ultimately it seems to contradict the very idea of 'communicative' as opposed to 'grammatical' competence. The lack of a pedagogic model of conversation of communicative interaction also means that when it comes to high stake testing involving large numbers of candidates, such as university entrance examinations, the test tends to be organised around pedagogical grammar. This after all is the English that all English speakers in Japan agree on including the all important *Monbusho*. While the use of say a transcript of an authentic casual conversation would in principle be an acceptable text in such examinations, in practice test writers may be reluctant to include conversational features that are likely to be overly distracting or unfamiliar to learners. Unfortunately these may be precisely the ones needed by learners to converse effectively. Universities cannot change their examinations until high school education changes, and high-schools cannot make their curricula more communicative, because of the pressures of university entrance examinations. Either way though an alternative description of conversation is needed that is discourse based and takes into to account differences between L1 and L2.

2.4 Containing chaos

> '*It is easy to get the impression that discourse analysis is at least a foolhardy, if not quite impossible undertaking, and that expanding the narrow range of phenomena that linguists study to include natural language in use causes all hell to break loose. Certainly the task is daunting. However the chaos can be contained in various ways, and, in fact, only some hell breaks loose.'*
> (Stubbs, 1983: 15)

Conversation and especially the everyday kind of chat we carry on with friends is slippery stuff to analyse. After all unlike say formal presentations, or almost any form of writing we are not usually aware of planning and organising what we say. While a technological revolution leading to the widespread availability of low cost recording equipment has been a great boon to conversational research, significant changes in the way we analyse and record conversation have also been called for. While Chomsky's (1965) model of syntax was concerned with an ideal speaker in a homogeneous community of speakers, discourse approaches have instead focused on the actual utterances of real speakers. In doing so discourse based models of language describe language as performed in context. Such a description of language in conversational use must on the one hand reflect human speech capabilities, and on the other human social and communicative organisation.

2.5   Philosophically speaking

'Philosophy' is in a large part the name for all those questions which we do not know how to answer in a systematic way that is characteristic of science.

(Searle, 2002: 20)

Within the philosophy of language two observations have been particularly influential on the description of everyday conversation. One is Austin's (1962) proposition that language could be used to *do* things, and his subsequent cataloguing of conversational speech acts, later rationalised by Searle (1969). The other is Grice's (1975) suggestion

that conversation is carried out in accordance with some basic ground rules ('maxims'), or shared assumptions without which mutual understanding and communication would be impossible. These insights into the nature of conversation are important because they helped descriptive linguistics to move beyond a preoccupation with syntactic form to consider language as something which exists within a social and communicative context. The ensuing shift in philosophy away from a preoccupation with language as a tool of logical deduction, was echoed in linguistics in the shift from a structural syntactic model based on the description of an ideal speaker (Chomsky, 1965), to functional models of grammar (Halliday, 1994) and the development of discourse analysis (Sinclair, 1992). The discovery of performatives was not just the discovery of a special class of magic phrases that had life changing power ('I sentence you to death' uttered by the presiding judge); it was the beginning of a recognition that speech is integrated into social life and institutions. Searle (2002: 156-179) has argued recently that the power of performatives resides not in their phraseology but in a system of agreed mutual beliefs which create the social framework that validates them. This is an important point because it helps explain why form and function are not always synonymous. This lack of a one to one relation between form and function is recognised by Austin's (1962) distinction between locution (literal meaning); illocution (functional meaning); and perlocution (implicit purpose).

Levinson (1983; 2000) has argued that Grice's (1975) maxims of quantity, quality, manner and relevance are the base assumptions of all meaningful conversation. It is easy to find samples of speakers who seem to deliberately flaunt the maxims by being uncooperative, and ethnographic studies (Abrahams, 1989; Reisman, 1989) have shown

that speech acts and even notions of appropriate quantity are open to considerable cultural variation. Reisman (1989) contrasts the silent Danes with highly talkative inhabitants of an Antiguan village. Nevertheless, it is helpful to recognise that these are not irreconcilable differences but variant styles of communication. Whereas Brown and Levinson (1978) working within a Gricean framework have argued that the fundamental precepts underlying customs of politeness are universal, others have pointed out that cultural misunderstanding arises from the fact that in practice people in different cultures can be playing two different social games (Yamada, 1997). It is perhaps difficult to reconcile these two perspectives. However a fundamental point not to be overlooked is that conversations (even cross-cultural ones) are examples of what Searle (2002) has called 'shared intentionality' (ibid: 194), or 'collective behaviour' (ibid). Both English learners, and users of English in an international context who are able to focus on this shared intention and see beyond the localities of conversational style will surely make effective communicators.

2.6   A model of conversation

The most promising description of overall conversational organisation to date, is to be found in the discourse analysis developed from the Sinclair & Coulthard model (Sinclair, 1992). They proposed a basic conversational exchange which consists of: initiation (I), response (R), and follow-up (F1). Each of these was subdivided on a hierarchical basis to describe the function of each of these moves independent of grammatical structure. Elicitations and requestives might be realised grammatically by questions, directives correspond with commands, and informatives with statements, however there is not necessarily a correspondence between discourse function and grammatical form. Thus

while 'Would you mind passing me the salt?' takes the form of a question, when uttered at the dinner table, it would be normally treated as a directive. A positive response would therefore be to pass the salt. Other responses such as 'I haven't finished with it' or 'I think it has run out' would be classified as negative or as temporizations. Although the original model was a description of discourse in secondary school classes, a number of modifications have been proposed to make it applicable to everyday conversation (Burton, 1981; Coulthard and Brazil, 1981; Francis and Hunston, 1992), perhaps the most fully developed of these is Tsui (1994). Tsui fills out the framework laid down by Sinclair and Coulthard (Sinclair, 1992) with a taxonomy of acts she suggests are to be found in everyday conversation. With further adaptation discourse models could be developed for language learners. This would require familiarising learners with the terminology but offers the advantage of drawing their attention to how conversational language is used contextually. A discourse model could help raise learner awareness of how the different acts are realised in L1 and L2.

2.7   Analysing conversation

> *Perhaps the greatest single event in the history of linguistics was the invention of the tape-recorder, which for the first time has captured conversation and made it accessible to systematic study.*
>
> (Halliday, 1994: xxiii)

Sacks' lectures on conversation (1995) (given at UCLA in the 60s) are full of rich insights into conversation and the papers on describing the organisation of turn-taking

16

(Sacks et al, 1974) remain popular starting points for the investigation of conversation (particularly in Japan: Tanaka, 1999). However, perhaps the greatest contribution that conversation analysis (CA) has made to conversational description is in establishing a method for transcribing and analysing data. Rather than refining the development of a particular model, CA has established a rigorous methodology for qualitative analysis of conversation. The key features of this research methodology can be summarised as follows:

1) *Recording of naturally occurring conversations.*

Instead of using formal interviews, or setting up experiments the preferred method is to record conversations as they occur in everyday settings. This approach is therefore ethnographical (with its roots in anthropological observation) and encourages the researcher to learn from their involvement with the subjects (who indeed might be friends or family of the researcher.)

2) *Ethical recording.*

Because CA researchers prefer to collect fly on the wall style recordings, ethics have become an issue. Since recordings are not made in the laboratory and the very knowledge that there is a tape-recorder was thought likely to affect data, the temptation was to make surreptitious recordings. Such an approach is now considered unethical and those who have told their subjects about recording them after the event, report angry responses (Coates, 1996). In practice the known presence of the tape-recorder or camera in conversational settings is soon forgotten, making it relatively easy to collect authentic data. It is also considered a matter of courtesy to allow all participants the freedom to

screen, and subsequently have the researcher destroy, any recordings they object to, or indeed comply with any other restrictions without question (Cameron, 2001). In transcriptions, or when quoting from the data, pseudonyms should be used throughout. Where recordings are shared with other researchers (for example as part of an academic presentation) the researcher should have the participants' permission to do so.

3) *Quality of data is more important than quantity.*

Rather than collecting volumes of data for statistical analysis, the CA researcher will look closely at relatively small samples of data. For this reason high quality recording and transcription is desirable. Markee (2000) recommends the use of sensitive microphones, and ideally video to capture as much detail as possible. Such detail is necessary to bring the transcriber / analyst back as closely as possible to the conversation, allowing for the fullest interpretation possible.

4) *Detailed and accurate transcription.*

For the conversation analyst, it is the original recording, rather than the transcription that is considered as the data. Conversation analysts take considerable care in the preparation of transcripts because they are interested in subtle details such as slips, and repetitions, and speaker overlap or tone of voice that are easily missed. Many conversation analysts also adopt a number of pop spellings to draw attention to colloquial features of pronunciation, however sometimes these may not be relevant to the argument being presented, and deserve restraint when preparing research for an international arena, as neither the spelling nor the implications of the different pronunciation are likely to be readily understood. With an increasing interest in the

integration of verbal and other forms of communication and the spread of video in conversational recordings, even the detail captured in CA transcripts cannot tell the whole story. An interesting extension of transcription techniques to include non-verbals is multi-modal description (Kress et al, 2001) which adds further detail by incorporating diagrams into the transcript.

5) *Analysis based on observation.*

Transcripts of everyday conversation can be very messy indeed. However, CA assumes that conversation is not a random exchange of utterances, but rather that a closer look at observable features will reveal things about the participants, and their conversational purpose. The job of the conversation analyst then is to account for what is found in the recordings in an ordered and concise way.

While there is a need for experimental work into conversation, CA sets high standards for qualitative investigation into conversation which must play a part in all serious discussion of conversational organisation today.

2.8   Vagueness, interpersonal language and *stuff* like that

One of the most obviously useful findings for language learners that has emerged from studies into conversation and spoken discourse is the functional linguistic description of certain vocabulary which has hitherto been regarded as sloppy language that classroom learners should have no need to concern themselves with. I have argued so far that discourse function and grammatical form should not be assumed to be identical. However there are some expressions that occur again and again in everyday

conversation, but are rarely found in written or more formal texts because of their interpersonal discourse function. Phrases like 'I mean', 'you know', 'you see' sometimes considered redundant space fillers, make a lot more sense when conversation is considered as both an informational exchange where, given and new information needs to be marked, and as playing an important part in consolidating the shared worlds of speakers. Back-channel responses such as 'I see', 'absolutely', 'really?', 'you're joking!' which tell the speaker just how their information is being received have tended to be excluded from language teaching because they serve a functional rather than grammatical purpose. However now that language teaching is becoming concerned with teaching communication, effective ways of teaching this important lexis are needed. One early proposal to incorporate such discourse vocabulary into a communicative syllabus was Brown and Yule's (1983b) outline of a course in interactional short turns, including the conversational affirmative 'right', filler noises like 'ah', 'um', 'er', and evaluative expressions such as '(I think) it's very nice'. It is precisely expressions like these which Japanese classroom learners tend to be unfamiliar with. It has been pointed out that traditional EFL textbooks offer a wider range of functional expressions than those written by Japanese writers (Kondo, 2002), however more comprehensive and well researched coverage is needed.

2.8.1   Discourse markers

Three particularly helpful sources for writers creating materials to develop vocabulary for conversational interaction (or indeed researchers investigating spoken language) are Channell (1994), Overstreet (1999) and Schiffrin (1988). Schiffrin's (ibid) work focuses on the description of a restricted set of very common discourse markers in conversation.

Her account of the use of words like 'and', 'so' and 'then' substantially extends traditional syntactic descriptions into a conversational context and brings to attention the importance of words like 'well', 'I mean', 'you know' as discourse markers. Although she makes it clear that the discourse and grammatical properties are intimately related, the resulting patterns of usage are quite different from those depicted in EFL pedagogy. EFL grammars and textbooks take time to explain that whereas 'because' can be used in a sentence initial position 'so' cannot. In contrast Schiffrin (ibid, 191-227) illustrates that 'so' occurs regularly at the beginning of utterances that mark either a topic shift or with narrative coda. In Japanese the pragmatic marker 'so' is often realised by *dakara*, however as Matsui (2001) illustrates *dakara* can also be used in cases where 'so' would be inappropriate in English.

(1)   His wife was in Paris when he was murdered. *Dakara* (so) she couldn't have done it.

(2)   Mother: Are you doing your homework?

        Son: *Dakara* (Can't you see?) I am doing it now.

                                                    [examples from Matsui, 2001: 870]

In the second example 'so' would be an odd translation of *dakara.* Such differences are a source of learner difficultly and it is for this reason it may also be helpful to develop models of conversation with an awareness of L1 norms.

2.8.2   *Vague language*

Vague language is something all too often associated with woolly thinking, or

uneducated speech, but Channell (1994) argues that vagueness is both widespread in conversational usage and essential in human communication. She demonstrates that the rounding of numbers and use of approximators such as '…or so' are systematic. She observes that the use of placeholders such as 'thingy' and 'whatsisname' can be used to cover for memory lapses, but may also signify the speaker's attitude to the unspecified person or object. More generally she illustrates how the use of vague language actually makes for more efficient communication within a socio-cultural and interpersonal context.

Overstreet's (1999) work uses a similar approach to focus on what she calls 'general extenders'. These are phrases like '…and stuff', 'and everything', 'and that kind of thing'. Like Channell (ibid) she argues that apparently vague expressions play an important role in communication. When a speaker uses the phrase '…and stuff like that', both they and the speaker are assumed to understand what is meant by 'stuff'. Much of the time the meaning would be recoverable from cultural or practical knowledge of the world, or contextual clues, but as Overstreet's example (also the title of her book) illustrates, examples may be very personal. 'Whales, candlelight, and *stuff* like that' for her denotes romantic shared experiences, and the use of such personalised meanings is in itself a way of showing intimacy or solidarity. Japanese is full of such general extenders and as a result learners often use 'etc' where they might use Japanese general extenders such as '*toka*' (spoken) or '*nado*' (written). For this reason it is relatively easy to introduce alternative general extenders to learners. An area in need of further exploration is how far discourse vocabulary translates from Japanese to English.

CHAPTER 3

DESCRIBING NARRATIVE

The ability to tell a good story or joke is a

highly regarded talent, probably in all cultures.

(McCarthy 1991: 137)

3.1   Narrative and conversation

While the term 'narrative' is often associated with its most elevated forms in literature and oral traditions, narrative is to be found everywhere in our daily lives (Barthes, 1977) and hence in everyday talk. Narratives convey the history of the world from one generation to the next, or the neighbour's latest gossip. Today when stories can spread through the Internet in seconds, the fortunes of the stock market or the safety of nations may depend on narratives (Denning, 2000). At the same time narrative plays an important role in individual psychological well being (Baerger & McAdams, 1999) and in building friendships (Ochs & Capps, 2001). Narrative is a way of sharing lived experiences, and reliving shared experiences. It stands to reason then that narrative skill, and especially conversational narrative skill is an important talent for language learners to nurture.

This chapter focuses on the description of conversational narrative as it has come to the attention of researchers in sociolinguistics (Eggins and Slade, 1997; Labov and Waletzky, 1967, Linde, 1999; Sacks, 1995; Schiffrin, 1996; Tannen 1989; Wolfson, 1978) psycholinguistics (Beaugrande & Colby, 1979; Emmott, 1999; Peterson &

McCabe, 1983; Rumelhart, 1977) and narratology (Bamburg, 1997a; Norrick, 2000; Toolan, 2001). In reviewing the literature, this chapter focuses on how it might be possible to develop conversational models of narrative for learners and the skills needed to effectively produce and interpret narratives.

3.2   Story grammars: an introspective approach

Propp's (1968) analysis of the elements of narrative to be found in fairy tales was an analysis of a literary genre. However the fact that the genre had existed for so long without anyone ever deconstructing it as he did, begged the question of why fables should orient around a particular cast and episodic structure, and why indeed it may be possible to apply the same analysis to such modern narratives as the *Star Wars* films (Toolan 2001: 19) as he did to traditional Russian folk tales. Is narrative the reflection of traditions which have simply become widespread, or do human beings share a narrative competence, similar to the grammatical competence proposed by Chomsky (1965)? In the 70's and 80's a number of psychologists investigated the organisation of narrative in an attempt to develop a grammar of stories (Beaugrande & Colby, 1979; Mandler & Johnson, 1980; Rumelhart, 1977; 1980; Thorndyke, 1977). Their work focuses on the role of memory and comprehension in the reconstruction of narrative. Just as world knowledge schema is required to interpret individual utterances (Goffman, 1974), narratives are organised to evoke a schema based on episodes embedded in a problem solution framework (Rumelhart, 1977).

> *Mary heard the ice cream man coming down the street. She remembered her birthday money and rushed into the house….* (ibid: 265)

In order to interpret this story fragment readers draw on experiences or knowledge of ice cream men and little girls who get birthday money. At the same time the causal relationship between these sentences is based on a problem-solution interpretation. Mary wants to buy an ice cream, her birthday money is needed to do this. Creation and interpretation of events based on schema is a fundamental narrative skill, that has been found in the earliest utterances by children (Sacks, 1995: I, 236-266) and continues to develop into adulthood (Berman & Slobin, 1994). The story grammars were an attempt to map out the details of the schema that came into play in the interpretation of narrative. In the same way that systemic grammar described an abstract rule based system of relationships between words, story grammars described an abstract organisation of episodic events in a narrative. Experimental work looked at the degree to which summaries or recounts of tales could be predicted by these grammars. Such experiments were carried out partly with a view to developing applied psychology, to help improve children's narrative skills (Peterson & McCabe, 1983). As a way of charting the organisation of episodes, this kind of analysis may be useful to EFL materials designers when preparing graded narrative tasks. It seems likely that the more complex the narrative in terms of embedded episodes, the greater the challenge for the learner in both understanding and reproduction. However story grammars offered a very limited perspective on narrative at a time when narrative studies were just taking off and so soon came in for some criticism. Perhaps the most famous objection to the story grammars is given by Black and Wilensky (1979) who argue that the rules for developing story grammars were based on convenient examples, and did not define narrative in a way which would exclude all non-narratives or include all narratives.

Certainly the story grammars do embrace what might be better described as recounts than stories, but a passage such as the fishing article they cite (ibid: 222) which is more of a hypothetical recount than a prototypical narrative is always going to be problematic to capture in a definition of narrative.

One area in which the story grammars have continued to be influential is in the development of artificial intelligence. For example Meehan (in Shank 1984) reports on an experiment in programming a computer to tell stories. As we can see from the following sample from the computer generated story of Joe Bear below, the computer produces a reasonably effective narrative:

> *One day Joe Bear was hungry. He asked a friend Irving Bird where some honey was. Irving told him there was a beehive in the oak tree. Joe walked to the oak tree and ate the beehive.* (Shank 1984: 83)

It is of course remarkable that computers can be built to generate stories based on abstract patterns of grammar and narrative, however it should be remembered that as with the marvels of computer graphics it is very much an illusion contrived to appeal to the human imagination. The formulaic 'one day' at the beginning and character names generate something recognisable as a child's story. The anaphoric association between Joe Bear, and 'him', and 'Joe' also follows predictable rules. However, as Emmott (1999) points out, the computer falls down with the association between the honey and the beehive. In the third sentence the beehive is introduced as a metonym for honey but other important facts about a beehive, such as that it is probably full of dangerous

stinging bees are overlooked. Nevertheless this narrative can still work because as readers we use our imagination to create a plausible interpretation. We may for example, assume that Joe bear is a particularly eccentric, or stupid bear, and laugh. Alternatively we might imagine that he is a particularly strong and dangerous bear who is immune to bee stings, and impervious to the woody texture of the hive. It is this active interpretation and the flexibility of focus that we take for granted whenever we use language that creates a particularly tough challenge for those working in developing language mechanisms for AI.

Unlike computers, however, adult EFL learners already have a well developed and flexible ability to interpret and create narrative in their own language which hopefully will become available to them in L2 as ability develops. Emmott (1999) examining the process of comprehension in reading narratives suggests that the ability to interpret anaphoric reference, far from being dependant on mechanical syntactic reference, is sometimes only possible due to a constant active revision of the story world in our consciousness. Her examples are based on analysis of references in novels but it seems reasonable to imagine that use of generalised schema, interacting with the more particularised knowledge of specific people and events, also play an important part in the interpretation of conversational narrative.

The role of schema in narrative comprehension is clearly important as in language interpretation generally (Goffman, 1974), however in order to be relevant to language learners the importance of schema needs to be developed from an abstract hypothetical model of narrative competence, to describe how narratives are actually told and

interpreted within everyday conversation.

3.3   'Like, what happened?' Eliciting narrative

Whereas psycholinguists investigated narrative in the laboratory, Labov and Waletzky's (1967; Labov, 1972; 1997) went out into the field and collected samples from over 600 speakers of a variety of ages and social backgrounds. They used minimal cues like 'You ever been in a situation where you thought you were gonna get killed?' (Labov, 1972: 361) followed up with a simple 'Like, what happened?' (ibid). This was an effective elicitation technique because the teller was put in a situation where they had to justify the remarkableness of their experience (how they were almost killed). In conversation stories temporarily monopolise talk and so need to sell themselves to listeners as worthwhile. According to Labov (1997) it is such out of the ordinary drama as narrow escapes from death that make good stories. The six part model proposed by Labov and Waletzky (1967) has to serve both listener and teller as a predictable format, but also make it possible to sell both the story and the message to the listener.

1. **Abstract:** a short overall summary of the story to be told.

2. **Orientation:** background details that locate the story in time and place and outline pertinent features of the situation.

3. **Complicating action:** the main action of the story.

4. **Evaluation:** establishing the point of the narrative/ reason for telling it.

5. **Result or resolution:** explaining what finally happened.

6. **Coda:** an ending 'that's it' which typically brings the listener back to the present.

Shorter recounts might omit parts such as the abstract or coda, while longer tales included more detail or complicating action. In addition Labov and Waletzky (ibid) found that speakers tended to use simple sentences in the past tense (narrative clauses), in the same order as the action had happened. These were interspersed with comments on the action (evaluative clauses). Reviewing Labov's account Toolan (2001) observes that the reordering of narrative clauses creates an implicit reordering of the narrative itself.

1 John fell in the river, got very cold, and had two large whiskeys.

2 John had two large whiskeys, fell in the river, and got very cold.

These two sets of clauses tell two different stories; one where the whiskey helps John recover from an unfortunate accident, the other a tale of inebriated folly (Toolan: 145). However these are not the only possible sentences that an English speaker could use to describe the events. A speaker could also say:

3 John got very cold after falling in the river when he had had two large whiskeys.

Grammatical devices make almost any clausal or temporal ordering possible, but a key feature of spoken narrative is that it maintains a sense of the action moving forward by keeping the clauses in chronological order. In contrast, evaluative clauses can be interspersed more freely because they are presumed to be independent of the narrative

time frame. We could for example add the phrase 'John is a crazy guy' at any point in the second version (2) that we felt happy to make a pause. Not only was this general model of conversational narrative found to be appropriate across the narratives collected by Labov and Waletzky (1967), but has proved a useful starting point for the investigation of narrative in a variety of contexts (see Bamberg, 1997b). If conversational narrative is organised in much the same way in Japanese and English and narrative is common in conversational discourse in L1, then narrative may be a useful framework to encourage learners to speak at length. If on the other hand there are significant differences in the organisation or production of narrative in Japanese and English, then these differences would be important points to draw learners' attention to. The simplicity of this model of narrative makes it an attractive one from a pedagogical point of view.

3.4   'You wanna hear my story?' Narratives in conversation

Influential as the Labovian model has been there are other important dimensions of spoken narrative organisation to consider. While Labov and Waletzky's interview technique was an effective way of eliciting narratives it did not take full account of the more interactive and spontaneous nature of conversational narrative as it occurs in everyday talk. Narratives are not isolated in everyday talk, but blend with the flow of conversation. Those who have looked more closely at narratives as they are produced in everyday talk (Eggins and Slade, 1997; Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1984; Norrick, 2000; Schiffrin, 1996; Tannen, 1989; Wolfson, 1979) or in institutionalised settings (Linde, 1999) argue for a broader definition of narrative in interactive, and collaborative tellings which take into account performance features, and the conversational context.

Sacks (1995), whose lectures on conversation were given at almost the same time as Labov and Waletzky (1967) were collecting their original data, examines recordings of group therapy sessions at a self-help centre. Unlike Labov's subjects, who were given the floor by the interviewer, participants in the group discussions have to bid for it, fend off interruptions, and clarify misunderstandings:

> Ken: You wanna hear muh-eh my <u>sis</u>ter told me a <u>sto</u>ry last night.
>
> Roger: <u>I</u> don'wanna hear it. But if you must. (0.7)[2]
>
> Al: What's purple en 'n island. Grape, Britain. That's w't iz si//ster-
>
> Ken: <u>No</u>:. To <u>stun</u> me she says uh (0.8) There wz these three girls 'n they jis got married?
>
> Roger: ehhh//hehh hhh hhh
>
> [22 lines later Ken finally gets an extended speaking turn to tell his story]
>
> (Sacks, 1995: vol. 2. 470)

Ken's bid for space to retell his sister's joke is challenged by Roger, discredited by Al's childish one liner and stalled by his conversational partners. Not all narrators have as much trouble as Ken does here trying to tell a dirty joke, but the way teller and listener interact is an important dimension of spoken narratives in naturally occurring conversation. Moreover the style of negotiation needed to tell a story, or the amount of support given by listeners is precisely the kind of difference that has been observed between Japanese and at least American speakers of English (Watanabe, 1993; Yamada,

---

[2] ( ) number indicates number of seconds pause; (0.7) means a seven second pause.

1992). Watanabe (ibid) found that her Japanese subjects speaking in Japanese both favoured the use of stories over logical argument and preferred a more cooperative organised discussion than the Americans. Watanabe (ibid) found that cross-cultural conflict was partly due to different expectations about the communicative organisation of conversation. Others have argued that both story content and negotiation style may reflect gender and power relations between speakers (Coates, 1996; 2003; Holmes, 1997) and Holmes (1997) suggests that listeners might be described as functioning on a supportive—unsupportive continuum, and narrators as telling on a solo-narrator—joint-construction continuum. For language learners it is clearly important that EFL teachers or materials designers are able to grade different story-telling situations in terms of difficulty. For a child learning his or her first language from a parent—or a second language learner speaking from a native—*supportive / joint construction* would seem the natural starting point. However for classroom learners working in pairs or groups, the opposite may be true as learning to negotiate meaning, or effectively support a teller creates additional challenges.

3.5   Looking at genre

For Eggins and Slade (1997), Labov's (1972) model is a useful tool for analysing what they call 'chunks'—that is extended speaking turns which contrast with 'chat'. Whereas chat can be analysed locally by looking at the turn-taking sequence, Eggins and Slade (ibid) observe that there are what they collectively call 'story-telling' sequences which need to be analysed from a macro-perspective. Looking at a variety of narratives that occur in their coffee break conversations they sub-divide these sequences into four genres: narrative; anecdote; exemplum; and recount. Their 'narrative' is the

full narrative in Labov; the others are extended turns, or turn sequences which recount something narrative-like, but each with a slightly different purpose. An anecdote omits the resolution as its main aim is to provoke a reaction (such as laughter) to some remarkable happening. Having achieved audience reaction at the climax there is no need to fill in the details. An exemplum (which she attributes to Plum—see Martin & Plum, 1997) contains a specific message about how the world should be. Finally the recount (derived from Martin, 1992) involves an ongoing evaluation. Since they view narratives as social events, as well as linguistic units, it is logical to classify them in accordance with their social purpose. For Eggins and Slade (1997) the speakers implicitly make a strategic choice of storytelling type according to their conversational intent. They extend their genre classification to other parts of the conversation adding observations/ comments; opinion; gossip; joke-telling; and sending up (friendly ridicule) (ibid: 265). Lucantonio (2002) reports success in using these genres as frameworks for encouraging learners to tell their own stories. Such conversational genres would seem like useful models on which to base speaking tasks, but more research is needed into both the genre types and the most effective way to use them in the classroom.

3.6   Storytelling in everyday talk, and borderline narratives

Norrick (2000) explores a broad range of naturally occurring oral narratives. The narratives he examines are classified as 1) personal stories of past experience, which are subdivided as: those told for self aggrandizement, embarrassing stories, and stories of troubles; 2) dream-telling; 3) third-person stories; 4) generalized recurrent experiences; 5) collaborative retelling and 6) collaborative fantasy. Norrick also extends his data collection from verbal narratives to jokes, and story-telling in drama and literature. In

doing so Norrick extends a definition of spoken narrative to the point where the border between narrative and other types of conversation becomes fuzzy (as do Ochs and Capps, 2001). The collaborative fantasies he discusses use conditionals instead of narrative clauses (see 'Clone Mark' Norrick, 2000: 130-131). Similarly his examples of generalised narrative show speakers talking about 'what used to happen' built up into a narrative-like sequence of events of its own.

> Ellen: and they would play a couple of games
>
> and they wouldn't play very well.
>
> and so guys would want to come up and bet them
>
> and then and uh so they'd lose the first game
>
> and they'd jerk them for the next three   (Norrick, 2000: 152)

This extract is from an account of the habitual practice of some college pool sharks which Norrick then goes on to break down into Labov-like narrative elements. Norrick's ultimate conclusion, however, is that since it seems to be possible to find narratives which contain no narrative clauses, a method of analysis which looks at 'the listener's task of reconstruction' (2000: 198) is more appropriate than the organisational model proposed by Labov and Waletzky (1967).

Ervin-Tripp and Küntay (1997) also found a number of narratives which appear to be on the border of non-narrative chat, yet are in many ways typical of conversational story-telling. Their earthquake stories rather like some of Sacks' (1995) tales are told in rounds. Moreover they seem to have other kinds of patterning in the collaborative move

from recounts of their direct experience through, to those of friends, animals to inanimate objects. Here an extract from one such collaborative telling:

1	Al:	you know that-
2		that *nice *glass *china *display case in our *dining room?[3]
3	Ned:	=in the *dining room=
4	Cyn:	=o-o-oh= =
5	Al:	**trashed
6	Cyn:	=forget it.=
	Ned:	=*absolutely= trashed. (Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1997: 147)

The orientation (1-2) need only identify the focus of the story. The foregrounded action (the china display was trashed by the earthquake) is expressed in the one word 'trashed'. Many of their stories do not seem to fit the Labovian model. Although like Norrick (2000), Ervin-Tripp and Küntay (ibid) call into question the relevance of narrative frameworks it seems to me more appropriate to think of these stories as illustrating a kind of conversational ellipsis. Just as we can simplify sentences in grammar by omitting (or pronominalising) elements that have occurred previously, so the narrative context seems to allow following speakers to cut straight to the relevant action. The principle of quantity (Grice, 1975) dictates that while speakers may need to justify and explain a story that is not an obvious follow-up, there is no need to provide background that is already understood as a result of the conversational context.

---

[3] The transcription conventions are: * is stress; = overlap=; = = latched response.

The fact that such a broad array of narratives is to be found in everyday conversation indicates that narrative is a useful resource that speakers readily adapt, or simplify to suit their needs. It seems likely that language learners too, once they have developed confidence to incorporate narratives into their speech will also find it a useful resource. Introducing learners to conversational narratives in a broad variety of contexts, perhaps presenting them at first in terms of genre, and later illustrating how speakers adapt it to their needs (using examples like those found in Norrick (2000)) may help learners develop narrative ability in the target language.

3.7   Performance narratives and dramatic features

So far this chapter has focused on the overall organisation of narratives in conversation, and the way in which narrative permeates everyday talk. This section however looks at ways speakers dramatise their narratives.

On re-examining Labov's narrative interview data discussed above (3.3), Wolfson (1982a) argues that the speakers are oriented to the interview situation and so do not display features that are typically associated with more informal types of conversational narrative. Like Eggins and Slade (1997) and Norrick (2000) she therefore adopts an ethnological approach, recording her subjects in conversational settings. She proposes that in more relaxed settings a certain style of telling can be classified as performed stories which would feature at least some of the following:

✦ Direct speech

✦ Asides

- ✧ Repetition

- ✧ Expressive sounds

- ✧ Sound effects

- ✧ Motions and gestures   (Wolfson, 1982a: 27)

These theatrical elements all serve to bring the narrative to life, and in so doing make their tale more persuasive. The process of dramatisation using these everyday rhetorical devices, allows the teller to highlight climatic or important areas of the narrative. They also allow the speaker to show their attitudes to characters and events in the story. Tannen (1989) offers a detailed account of the features of dramatic performed narratives and illustrates how, conversational storytellers use these devices to make their tales more effective. In doing so she points out that performed conversational narrative has parallels with literature. Drawing on this kind of analysis teachers might use authentic conversational texts to raise learners' awareness of the importance of such devices in conversation. Just as a writer may learn effective literary techniques from the study of literature, so the foreign language student may also benefit from an understanding of speaker rhetoric. Ochs and Capps (2001: 59-112) have pointed out that while the impulse to narrate may be intuitive, narrative style is something that people develop through their upbringing. Minami (2001) characterised Japanese children's narratives as 'concise stories that are cohesive collections of several personal experiences' (Minami, 2001: 57). Through recording and analysing mother-child interaction Minami (ibid) shows how the mother's style of scaffolding is reflected in the children's narrative development. In an intervention study with economically disadvantaged preschool children Peterson, Jesso, and McCabe (1997) found that children whose mothers had

encouraged narrative conversation through positive back-channel produced more developed narratives, than those who did not. Fivush et al (1991) also observe that Caucasian-American middle class mothers discouraged elaboration and performance in favour of a focus on telling *the facts.* Ochs and Taylor (1992) make a similar observation but note that this ultimately discourages narrative telling.

This module has so far looked at descriptions of conversation and narrative, and their relevance to Japanese EFL learners from a theoretical perspective. The following chapter instead looks at narratives produced by learners using narrative tasks in the classroom. It considers the role of tasks in developing narrative skill and how conversational narrative description might be useful in improving or complementing such tasks.

CHAPTER   FOUR

NARRATIVE TASKS AND CONVERSATION TEACHING

A task is an activity in which

- *Meaning is primary*
- *Learners are not given other people's meanings to regurgitate*
- *There is some sort of relationship to comparable real world activities*
- *Task completion has some priority*
- *The assessment of the task is in terms of outcome.*   (Skehan, 1998:95)

4.1   Narrative tasks

Tasks have long been seen as a way to develop communicative competence within a classroom setting (Prabhu, 1987) but they have also become widespread in second language acquisition research (Bygate, 1996; 2001; Skehan & Foster, 2001; Skehan & Swain, Eds. 2001), and language testing (Chalhoub-Deville, 2001; Norris et al., 2002; Skehan, 2001b). This has meant that to some extent the requirements of quantitative research have taken precedence over pedagogical considerations in task design generally. In particular studies into task-based learning have focused on analysing the effects of tasks on learner fluency, accuracy, and complexity (Foster, 1998; Skehan, 1998; Robinson, 2001; Skehan and Foster, 1999). These are important dimensions of spoken performance to bear in mind both when designing tasks and measuring learning. However in order to obtain comparable data for investigating tasks or assessing students, researchers have tended to use retelling tasks rather than encourage original narratives. As a result there is a need to balance this emphasis on comparability with a clearer

indication of the relation between classroom tasks and conversational usage outside the classroom, and develop tasks which promote greater learner autonomy. It is certainly foreseeable that one might wish to recount what happened in a Mr. Bean video (Skehan & Foster, 1999) or a Tom and Jerry Cartoon (Bygate, 1996) if it had some relevance, or newsworthiness, but these activities are not the typical narratives of daily talk. Moreover, whereas text-book narrative tasks have tended to be individual retellings of various kinds, narratives in everyday talk are more interactive and personal (see chapter 3). For this reason it is important that task based learning includes encouraging narratives derived from the learners' own experience, and gives an active role to the listener. In addition to finding the right level of challenge in tasks it is important to encourage greater learner involvement and emphasise skills closer to those used in everyday conversational narrative. Ideally conversational narrative tasks would involve learners in using the interpersonal language discussed in chapter 2.

4.2   Data source

In order to begin looking at learner narratives the author recorded and transcribed some learner narratives examining them with a view to establishing a direction for research in future modules. The conversational narratives discussed here were recordings of Japanese first year university students in classes taught by the author. The learners were in intact regular classes as opposed to experimental ones (TOEIC scores were around 400). Not only are these learners much poorer at English than for example Japanese who gain entry to British universities, but for reasons outlined in chapter 2 these

learners had had little experience of using English communicatively, or even being taught in English before entering university. The learners were given a variety of conversational retelling tasks followed up with a telling of a personal narrative which was first prepared as a written assignment. Some of the more interesting recordings were transcribed, and those discussed here appear in Appendix I.

4.3 Encouraging interaction in tasks

In everyday conversation, narratives do not occur in a vacuum. At the very least there is a listener who may be more or less involved in the story, depending on many factors including the relation between teller and listener, the relevance of the story to the listener and the perceived interest or remarkableness of the story itself. When preparing narrative tasks for learners the interest level of a story can to some extent be manipulated. Asking the listener to reproduce the story they hear in some way can be an effective way of stimulating involvement on the part of the listener, creating a more interactive telling. In addition while spontaneous narratives were considered beyond the language abilities of these learners having them tell a prepared personal story to a partner helped to make the task more meaningful to the learners. To prepare for this, learners wrote their stories as a homework assignment beforehand. On the day of the

telling however, learners had to put away their papers, so that they were effectively

performing a retelling of their own tale. Instead of passively listening to a narrative the

learners were required to write notes on the story told by their partner. The experience

of having trouble following her partner's narrative appears to encourage the second

narrator to make continuous checks on her partner's understanding. First let us look at

what generates the frustration:

(1)   Yuko : I went to Nasu in vacation

        Mimi: you went to Nasu in vaction {echoing}

        Yuko: We decide to go there. / Then we go.

→   Mimi: un? {as if to say 'what?'}

        Yuko: Then before, / Then we go to there,

        Mimi: Ok.

        Yuko: I, / have to work

→   Mimi: Work {doubtfully, but not questioning}

                                        ['Skipping Work' Appendix I]

This is all part of the orientation, yet the listener Mimi, seems unclear about the

ordering of events. When does she go? When does she work? This may be due to the

lack of qualifiers (I was *supposed* to work…) which might have clarified the status of

her conflicting work commitments and holiday plans. In the end she arranges for a

friend to work her shift but is unable to explain the situation to her boss. She tries to say

on the one hand that she enjoyed herself, but that she is worried that her boss will be

angry with her. However, her listener seems to remain confused and rather than

expressing sympathy for her feeling of embarrassment asks her to repeat:

(2)   Yuko: Next day, he called me.

                And he

                What happened to [you yesterday

      Mimi: [oh

      Yuko: I felt embarrass

                I said, 'I…play'

→   Mimi: Mm? Once more please?

                                 ['Skipping Work' Appendix I]

Her story is unintentionally but effectively deflated, and ends with an embarrassed laugh by the teller. When Mimi comes to tell her story both she and her partner seem to have a sense that it is important to clarify as the story progresses.

(3)   Mimi: uh I was elementary school children

              Yuko: yes

              Mimi: I went to a department store with my parents.

              Yuko: yes

              Mimi: I will talk about this.

              Yuko: Ok.

→   Mimi: Ok?

                    Um I don't remember when I was elementary school children

              Yuko: Really? {giggles}

→   Mimi: Uh, I don't remember when I was elementary school children but I

                    remember [about this

              Yuko: [unn {understanding sound} re remember

→   Mimi: remember

                              ['Baby Chair' Appendix I]

Yuko seems to listen carefully and shows signs of involvement (such as laughter) as the

childhood story progresses.

(4)   Mimi: ok…baby chair, baby chair, I was interested in this

                I sat on this.

                And fastened belt

        Yuko: Ok.

        Mimi: Ok?

                A few minutes passed.

                I wanted to…get over.

        Yuko: Ok.

        Mimi: get over, but belt [didn't, come off, ha ha {laughs}

→   Yuko: [ha ha, ha ha ha {laughing}

        Mimi: I confused, I shouted ['help me, mother' {excitedly}

→   Yuko: [{laughs}

        Mimi: Ok?

→   Yuko: Ok {laughing}   ['Baby Chair' Appendix I]

At least for these learners, the task seems to be effective because there is a genuine need to interact with their partner while telling the story. In the process, this creates interest and real communication.

Both the transcript and recording of these tellings may give the impression that these are spontaneous recounts. However, a close comparison of them with the original submitted paper suggests that the learners went to a lot of trouble to memorise these tellings as most of the wording was identical to the submitted written versions[4]. In fact three of the main points of departure in Mimi's narrative from her original submitted version derive from corrections by the teacher. In her English written version she wrote 'I had be interesting very much' which was corrected to 'I was very interested in it' and appears correctly here. The expression 'I wanted to get *over*' sounds odd but looking at the original paper could well have been a result of a misreading of 'out' as 'over'. In this case the task was performed as part of a test with advanced warning given. It would have been interesting to see how this worked with a later repetition given without warning.

---

[4] Similar parts have been underlined in the transcripts in Appendix I

4.4   Theme in learner narratives

It has been argued that the telling of a conversational story, for all the universality of structure implicit in the narrative organisational features discussed in chapter 3, is nevertheless culturally specific. Polanyi (1985) in her analysis of conversational narratives collected in the US, argues that both underlying and perpetuating is 'the American Story' an ideological construct reflecting American values and containing a cast of recognisable characters. Notions of tellability are also dependant on scenario norms from which a story must depart to demonstrate remarkableness. She also points out the production of narratives in conversation is culturally constrained. Having learners tell their own stories is one way to find out about the story-world values of their L1.

4.5   Individual narrative style

Unlike Yuko and Mimi, a learner in the same class (this time a male student) who will be referred to here as 'Taro' produced a much more fragmented style of narration, about a recent and more mundane event, which nevertheless involves his listener. His story is about a day he left his house key at home. However far from dramatising the event he presents himself as an easy going person almost oblivious of his predicament. His story

ends with an apparently incidental climatic frustration over losing his beer to his father.

(5)   Taro: so uh I get uh beer

               uh I'm standing in line

               Then uh I uh I I I am uh tap   [uh tap tap   um pat my uh back [

        Kenzou: [hoh …   [yeah

        Taro: From uh my back person

                       I I turn back

                       Uh then uh

                       My mother is

                       My mother standing

        Kenzou: no!

        Taro: ha, my mother says uh 'hi'

                       'What is, what do you buy?'

                       ah ha uh oh Oh no   [I think 'oh no'=

        Kenzou: [ha ha oh ha ha ha =

        Taro: I couldn't say nothing

                       Uh and I safety entered

        Kenzou: oh

        Taro: Uh my beer is drinking

                       drinken by my father

        Kenzou: no!

        Taro: Oh my, oh my beer…   ['Locked Out' Appendix I]

48

Although obviously the story of one young man to another (as signalled by the interest in buying beer under age) it is very different in mood from the stories of young men in Britain discussed by Coates (2003). Here is an extract from her transcript of some young men describing being told off by a neighbour for playing football in their underpants while drinking beer:

Chaz: what in your duds wi' fuck all?

George: duds and boots like […] fucking next-door neighbour comes out

like fucking Garath or whatever he's called from-

Dave: is that what he's called?

George: 'I'm from Wales' fucking   [Coates, 2003: 1]

The salient use of swearing, and the unabashed boastfulness, of their laddish prank, which Coates sees as typical of all-male talk, from another perspective could also be regarded as typically British. Of course a class assignment is certain to bring with it rather different expectations than sharing stories outside, but how different is an important area to investigate in later modules.

In the follow up story, Taro acts as a supportive listener. At first rather cool to his story about a visit to the popular rock group 'Glay' (I suspect that his exaggerated 'really' reflected the fact that he thought them to be rather unhip) Taro gradually warms to his enthusiastic recount of his experience:

(6)　　Kenzo:　　　　um Glay is my favourite groups.

　　　　Taro:　　　　Really??　　　　{slightly shocked, perhaps disapproving?}

　　　　Kenzo:　　　　Yeah

　　　　{SEVERAL LINES OMITTED}

　　　　Kenzo:　　　　they um showing brilliant performance

　　　　 Taro:　　　　mm

　　　　 Kenzo:　　　　very heavy sounds

　　　　 Taro:　　　　mm

　　　　 Kenzo:　　　　and uh beautiful melody

　　　　 Taro:　　　　mm

　　　　 Kenzo:　　　　people all standing

　　　　 Taro:　　　　standing ovation?

　　　　 Kenzo:　　　　yeah

　　　　 Taro:　　　　ho ho ho good!　　　　['Live Concert' Appendix I]

This learner's unembarrassed enthusiasm about his experience is typical of several of the narratives which dealt with visits to rock concerts or participation in sporting events,

which seem to have particularly excited them, but again unlike the cool, unemotional image that the British men recorded by Coates (2003) seem keen to convey.

4.6   The angry man and the impudent woman

Showing anger in a physical way, such as shouting or remonstrating is virtually taboo in Japan, because of its disruptive effect on social harmony. This is not to say that people do not feel angry, rather that they do not like to display their feelings through public remonstration. Only five of the learners (out of 120) chose to tell stories of times they got angry, and of these two concerned etiquette on the trains. One of these was about 'an impudent woman' who selfishly takes up valuable seating space with her luggage and a 'courageous' man who after giving up his own seat to an old lady, angrily insists that the impudent woman move her bags so that he can sit down. This story is insightful because it describes the unspoken communication which is sometimes said to characterise Japanese communicative style (Yamada, 1997: 37-51).

(7)   Ken: One day when I took a train

Uh, there was an impudent woman

Uh, she was sitting on the seat

And she was putting her bag and pouch, uh next to here

And she was reading a newspaper

51

I thought how shameless she is

Uh, an old lady came there

But she didn't move her bag and pouch

Uh, uh when the old lady was about to went away

One man standing, one man was standing and said the old

lady

'Please be seated'

then she said 'thank you' and sat on the seat

suddenly the man moved in front of the impudent woman

and hit her newspaper

 uh she was very surprised

and he said the woman uh

'move your bag immediately'

uh, and she moved the bag and pouch

and he sat that space

I was, I thought

How courageous he is

Another fellow passenger said nothing but

He expressed himself [clearly,

Shunta: [hmm

Ken: Hi his behaviour is good example for us to follow

        I show him…honour   ['The Impudent Woman' Appendix I]

Trains in Tokyo are typically crowded and although there is a recognised etiquette,

many people have stories to tell about bad experiences with particularly rude people,

and indeed such stories are exercises in defining what is heroic, and what is anti-social

behaviour. The woman is cast as 'impudent' (*shitsurei* or 'rude' in his Japanese version)

from the beginning of the narrative, because she fails to take account of those around

her. Not only is she inconsiderate in letting her bags take up valuable seating space in

the first place, but she ignores the plight of the old woman. The man's outburst is

surprising because he openly displays his anger in front of complete strangers. However

it is also applauded as implicitly justified and unselfish anger. Moreover the narrator

assumes that all the other passengers both observed this happening and sympathised

with the man's actions even though they gave no visible response. The importance of

anticipating other people's thoughts or feelings is also said to play a role in everyday

communication in Japanese, so that indirect styles of speaking are preferred to direct

ones. What Yamada (1997) calls *sasshi* (guessing at what your partner means) is said to

be essential to Japanese conversation. But is this reflected in the language? If so how? Is

Japanese really a more vague language than English and if so do learners have to work

to make their language more precise in English? Comparing this version of the narrative

with the Japanese retelling may offer some hints.

4.6.1   References to people

The use of the pronouns '*kare*' (he) and '*kanajo*' (she) and the corresponding object and

possessive pronouns is unusual in Japanese discourse, and the use of them is effectively

a stylistic imitation of English (Obana, 2000: ch.4). Instead nominal reference or

deletion is the preferred choice. Comparing the way this learner refers to the three

characters illustrates this effectively (see tables 1 & 2). Interestingly the only

Table 1: Reference to characters in the English spoken learner narrative 'The Impudent

Woman' (Appendix I)

	Nominal	Pronominal	deleted
Impudent woman	impudent woman (2) the woman (1)	she (7) (possessive) her (2)	(0)
Old woman	Old lady (3)	She (1)	(0)
Man	one man (2) the man (1)	he (4) him (1) his (1)	(0)

Table 2: Reference to characters in the Japanese spoken learner narrative 'The Impudent

Woman' (Appendix I)

Japanese	Nominal	Pronominal	deleted
Impudent woman	*..no oiteita obasan* (2) *kono obasan* (1) *sono obasan* (3)	*jibun no* (1)	(3)
Old woman	*rouba* (2) *kono obaasan* (1) *sono obaasan* (1) *obaasan* (2)	(0)	(1)
Man	*otoko no hito* (4)	*Jibun no* (1)	(3)

pronoun in the whole Japanese episode is *jibun no. Jibun* means 'self', often used as a

first person pronoun is here used as a third person pronoun. Besides the lack of

pronouns a marked feature of the Japanese narrative is the omission of the subject

altogether. One strategy for doing this is the use of the topic marker '*wa*' to identify the

protagonist in the ensuing discourse. In each case the character is first introduced with

'*ga*' the subject marker, then established as a discourse topic with '*kono……..…wa*'

meaning literally 'this...' (e.g. 'this man'). The topic marker means that other characters

can be identified as the subject of verbs, but that other verbs belong to the topic.

(8)   Ken: *kono otokono hito   wa(1),   totsuzen,*
                            this   man   [topic marker]   suddenly

        Sono, nimotsu wo   oiteita   obasan   no   tokoro ni   itte,
        That   luggage   [IDO]   put down middle-aged woman [possessive M]   place   to   went

        Ee,   sono obasan,   wa   shinbun wo   yondeitan desu   kedo
        Yeah, that   middle-aged woman, [topic marker]   newspaper [IOM]   was reading   [politeness M]   however

        Sono shinbunn wo   omoikiri   tataki otoshimashita(2)
        That   newspaper   [IOM]   as hard as possible   hit   made fall down

        Shunta: *nn, nn, nn*
                           Right, right, right

        Ken: *Soshite, sono obasan ni*
                          Then   that   woman   to

                          'jama   da,   dokase(4)',   to imashita (3)
                          in the way   [emphatic]   move   said

                                    ['The   Impudent   Woman'   Japanese,
                           Appendix I]

Not only does *wa (1)* identify the man as the person who hits the newspaper here *(2)*,

but as the person who then speaks to her a few lines later *(3)*. In the English this learner

moves from using indefinite reference 'an' and 'one' to introduce characters, later

identifying them with the definite article ('the man') but supplementing these with

56

personal pronouns. Whereas in English quotative verbs such as 'said' normally require a nominal or pronominal agent、they are usually omitted in Japanese. The avoidance of pronouns may strike English speakers as unnecessarily vague, however the use of them does not necessarily lead to increased clarity.

(9)   …an old lady came there

         But she didn't move her bag and pouch   [see (7) above]

She refers not to the old lady but to the woman who had left her bag on the seat. In practice the identification of the pronoun is dependent on the same active interpretation based on contextual clues in English as is required in Japanese to identify deleted subjects. However this learner's narrative is easier to follow than some because vague references in Japanese are replaced by specific ones in English. The man's angry: '*jama da, dokase'* (literally 'in the way, move') becomes 'move your bag immediately' since in other contexts the same phrase could be used to mean 'get out of my way'. On the other hand this translation looses the sense of '*jama*' meaning 'it is in the way'. Line 23 'he expressed himself clearly' is rather unclear, simply because he uses an untypical English expression. If he had said instead: 'The other passengers said nothing, but they

all felt he had made his point' perhaps the learner's message might have been clearer.

The snippets of learner narratives that have been discussed here illustrate that narrative tasks can provide a way for relatively low level learners to experience the problems of communicating extended discourse real-time, and that an emphasis on learner generated narrative can encourage creativity and give learners a voice in English. However, while learners are presented with some important challenges moving from L1 to L2 they are also depending on skills developed in L1. There is a need to continue the search into the effectiveness of tasks on acquisition but this needs to be balanced with an understanding of what constitutes authentic conversational narrative and narrative interaction. In order to develop more authentic conversational tasks it would also be useful to have a better understanding of what learners bring with them to the classroom and how this can be built on.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

5.1   Conclusion

In a limited space this module has taken a rather broad sweep at reviewing developments in conversation and narrative description that might offer guidance to EFL pedagogy, with a particular focus on Japanese learners. It has been argued that while communicative approaches to language teaching have heralded positive changes in the language learning classroom, these changes have not yet been balanced with a communicative pedagogic model of language. Especially task-based learning seems on the one hand to offer learners an opportunity to use language meaningfully in the classroom, and on the other opportunities for the materials designer to manipulate the level of challenge, or target specific conversational skills or language. However this important focus on creating tasks which are designed to trigger language learning mechanisms, needs to be balanced with other dimensions of language and language learning. The growing recognition of the potential of form in language teaching indicates that it may be beneficial to complement tasks with consciousness-raising activities. Learners may also benefit from focusing on social as well as cognitive dimensions of language. Authentic tasks should ideally be encouraging communication that is not just cognitively involving, but communicatively meaningful. For this reason conversational narrative seems a particularly worthwhile direction to pursue.

Much of the descriptive research on spoken narrative reviewed here was done with linguistic applications quite apart from foreign language teaching in mind. As a result

these descriptions need to be extended, and developed with language learners in mind. The examples of conversational description discussed in the preceding chapters have taken a variety of approaches to conversational narrative and how to research it. Whereas the psycholinguistic research of Rumelhart (1977) used carefully constructed laboratory work, the sociolinguistic study of Labov (1972) was based on a large scale sample, then again Tannen (1989) focused on detailed descriptions of her own conversations with friends. The picture of spoken narrative that has emerged is of a particularly remarkable human faculty for creation and interpretation that finds its most basic form in everyday conversational narratives. As a result it seems reasonable to propose that learners develop conversational skills in the classroom by exercising this faculty. Yet at the same time learners are in need of some guidance to develop beyond this. Conversational and narrative techniques, while they may already be well developed in a learner's L1, nevertheless are a highly relevant focus for learning an L2, whether the learner is building on skills developed in L1 or has to learn new ones particular to the target language. As the classroom is different from the outside world it is important that learners or those who teach them understand how conversation is used in the outside world and how similar skills can be nurtured in the classroom. For this reason future modules need to look both in more detail at learner narratives and at those in the world around them both in Japanese and English. It would be helpful, for example, to establish where and how Japanese and English narratives differ and what the consequences of this might be for Japanese EFL learners.

APPENDIX I

LEARNER NARRATIVES

Contents:

---

[5] All names used in these transcripts are pseudonyms.

Yuko Narita　　**'Skipping Work'**　　　　**Spoken English transcript**

Yuko:　　　　I went to Nasu in vacation

Mimi:　　　　you went to Nasu in vacation

Yuko:　　　　we decide to go.. there

　　　　　　　then we go

Mimi:　　　　un?

Yuko:　　　　then before

　　　　　　　then we go to there

Mimi:　　　　ok

Yuko:　　　　I, have to

　　　　　　　the day I have to work

Mimi:　　　　work

Yuko:　　　　but I want to go,

Mimi:　　　　un

　　　　　　　I told my friend to,

　　　　　　　Take my place.

Mimi:　　　　take my place, yeah.

Yuko:　　　　she agreed

Mimi:　　　　alright, huh

Yuko:　　　　I ..go to work

Mimi:　　　　ok

Yuko:　　　　told him to that

　　　　　　　I said the schedule

Mimi: I see

Yuko: but he was he is in holiday

Mimi: ok

Yuko: I…told called called him three or four times

Mimi: yeah

           but he didn't answer the telephone

Mimi: ok

Yuko: next day I go to Nasu

Mimi: yes

Yuko: and I called him again, ok

           tell him that I couldn't work

           I couldn't go work

           My friend instead of me

Mimi: I see, huh

Yuko: I have have good time

           In Nasu

Mimi: yeah

Yuko: next day, he called me

           and he

           'what happened to [you yesterday'

Mimi: [oh

Yuko: I felt embarrass

           I said 'I.. play'

Mimi: mm? one once more please.

Yuko:	I I wa-
	I played
Mimi:	m
Yuko:	Because I play I couldn't work go work
	I felt embarrass
	Next day
Mimi:	yeah
Yuko:	I apologise him
Mimi:	yeah
Yuko:	he wasn't, angry very much
Mimi:	ooh…really?
Yuko:	un ha ha ha {embarrassed laugh}
Mimi:	ok

Mimi Tanaka   **'Baby Chair'**   **written English narrative**

When I was elementary schoolchildren, I went (to) shopping to department store with my parent. I will talk about then. I don't remember about when I was elementary school children, but I remember about this happening. I went to toilet with my mother. And I went alone. There was baby chair. I had be interesting very much[6]. I sat on this baby chair and fastened its belts. A few minutes passed, I would went out[7]. But belts didn't take off!! I was confused. I shouted 'Help me, mother!!' The way that took off the belts was put on the wall back me. My mother took off the belts. I can went out. When I sat on baby chair, I thought I never went out[8]. If I went to the toilet alone, I couldn't go out.

_____ = repeated in spoken narrative

- - - - - - -   = corrected and repeat corrected version (or close) in spoken narrative.

****

Mimi Tanaka   **'Baby Chair'**   **spoken English transcript**

Mimi:	My name is Mimi Tanaka
Yuko:	ok
Mimi:	ok
	uh I was elementary school children
Yuko:	yes
Mimi:	I went to a department store with my parents
Yuko:	yes
Mimi:	I will talk about this

---

[6] Corrected to: 'was very interested in it'
[7] Corrected to: 'wanted to get out'
[8] Corrected to: 'I thought I would never get out'

Yuko:	ok
Mimi:	ok?
	Um I don't remember when I was elementary school children
Yuko:	really ?{giggles}
Mimi:	Uh I don't remember when I was elementary school children
	[but I remember about this happening
Yuko:	[unn{understanding sound} re, remember?
Mimi:	Remember.
Yuko:	yes
Mimi:	Ok?
Yuko:	Ok.
Mimi:	I went to Toilet oes[9]…..Ok?
Yuko:	Ok
Mimi:	I went to Toilet oes with my mother
Yuko:	Ok
Mimi:	and I went in Toileto oes …all
Yuko:	{laughs} really?
Mimi:	Ok?
Yuko:	Yeah I see…….once [more please
Mimi:	[and…
	I went in Toilet oes all [elementary in my day school children all round I went round I went in
Yuko:	[mm nn
Mimi:	There were, there were a child's baby chair
Yuko:	yes
Mimi:	Baby chair
	I was very interested in this
Yuko:	mm
Mimi:	ok?
Yuko:	mm
	ok….baby chair, baby chair I was very interested in this
	I sat on this
	And fasted belt

---

[9] The pronunciation of 'toilet' was particularly bad and sounded more like 'tall red toes', however this transcript was prepared to reflect discourse organization rather than grammatical accuracy, and so the 'oes' was left as a reminder of this.

Mimi:	ok[
Yuko:	[ok?
Mimi:	A few minutes passed
	I wanted to …get over,
Yuko:	ok
Mimi:	get over
	But belt [didn't
Yuko:	[ha ha
Mimi:	[came off
Yuko:	[ha ha ha…ha ha
Mimi:	I confused I shouted
	['Helping mother'
Yuko:	[{laughs}
Mimi:	ok?
Yuko:	ok {laughing}
Mimi:	and my mother came in my toilet
Yuko:	{continues laughing then stops as next part begins}
Mimi:	took off the belt
	and the way that took off the belt
	put on the wall above me
Yuko:	the wall above me?
Mimi:	uh the way the belt took off…put on the wall, um the way
	um the way um the way take off the belt Ok?
Yuko:	the way?
Mimi:	um put on the wall um above me
Yuko:	[ah mm mm mm mm {finally acknowledges understanding—Japanese
	sounding}]
Mimi:	Ok?
Yuko:	Mm mm mm {Japanese sounding}
Mimi:	um I could get get off another bed
	as I sat on baby chair I would never get on
Yuko:	{laughs}
Mimi:	I thought… I thought …I never I would never [get off
Yuko:	[mm mm…ok
Mimi:	Finish

Taro Yamada   **'Locked Out'**   **written English narrative**

One day I went to school without bringing my home key. I took lessons from morning to afternoon, and I talked with my friends in front of school. One of my friends said 'I'm hungry, shall we have lunch together?' Just in time I'm very hungry, too. I said 'It's a good idea, Let's go!! by the way, what will you have?' The other of my friends said 'I want to eat Chinese noodles in soup,' I said 'Oh!! I just know a good shop. Let's go there!!' and we went to the shop. Its shop's name is 'Hōka', It's my best of Chinese noodles shop. We finished eating, my friends said 'It's really good taste!! Thank you for bringing me along' I'm delighted to hear that, and we went home, I got to my home. Then my home locked. I said 'Oh!! My God!!' The day I forgot key at home. I could open a lock with the key. I'm very disappointed. I specially didn't have what to do. I lost no time in going to the supermarket near my house because I'm thirsty. I looked beer. I want to drink beer because I'm angry, and I'm from stand in line to buy beer[10]. Just then my back person pat my shoulder. I took a backward glance, my mother is standing!! I'm very surprised!! And my mother said 'Hi what do you buy?' I can't say nothing, and I entered my home. My beer is drunken by my father. Oh no!! My beer…

****

Taro Yamada   **'Locked Out'**   **spoken English transcript**

Taro: My name is Ryu Tanaka

        Er the day

        Eh I went to the home

---

[10] Taro is 18 years old, but the legal age for buying alcohol is 20 in Japan. It seems from his story that his parents are unaware that he sometimes drinks beer and may have disapproved.

	Uh I went to school without bringing the home key
Kenzou:	really
Taro:	yes
Kenzou:	oh
Taro:	uh the day
	uh I took lesson
	uh from morning to afternoon
Kenzou:	oh
Taro:	uh my lesson's er finish
	I talked uh
	I talked with uh my friend
	Uh in front of my uh school uh
	Uh one of my friends says
	'I am very hungry' uh
	'Shall we, shall we have a lunch'
Kenzou:	yeah
Taro:	er I said er 'I am very hungry too'
	er 'let's go'
	The other of my friends says
	'by the way er
	what er what do we eat'
	My friend says
	'I want to have Chinese noodle is'
Kenzou:	oh

Taro:	I said 'oh…I just know …a very good shop'
Kenzou:	oh
Taro:	uh 'Let's go there'
	uh ..and we went to the shop
	uh the shop's name is Hoka
	uh It's uh my favourite of shops
Kenzou:	oh
Taro:	uh then we uh we uh
	we have uh uh lunch there
	and uh I finished eating uh Chinese noodles uh
	then uh my friend said
	'it's uh, really good tasting'
	I uh I I am very delighted to
	hear the
	Hear that
	And uh we go home
	Uh and uh I get to the home
	But my home is my home is locked
Kenzou:	oh!! he he he he {laughs}
Taro:	I said uh 'Oh my god!'
	Uh the day is uh
	The day I forgot taking
	I forgot taking uh my home key
Kenzou:	that's too bad

Taro:	ha ha ha yes
	uh so I entered
	so I couldn't enter uh the home
	I very uh disappointed
	Uh uh I I didn't uh
	I I didn't have want to
	Want to do
	Uh I I went to
	I went to uh supermarket near my house
Kenzou:	oh
Taro:	Um uh I I looked uh beer
	Uh Then uh I'm very thirsty
	Uh uh I want to drink beer
Kenzou:	yes
Taro:	so uh I get uh beer
	uh I'm standing in line
	Then uh I uh I I I I am uh tap [uh tap tap um pat my uh back [
Kenzou:	[hoh … [yeah
Taro:	From uh my back person
	I I turn back
	Uh then uh
	My mother is
	My mother standing
Kenzou:	no!

Taro:	ha, my mother says uh 'hi'
	'What is, what do you buy?'
	ah ha uh oh Oh no [I think 'oh no'=
Kenzou:	[ha ha oh ha ha ha =
Taro:	I couldn't say nothing
	Uh and I safety entered
Kenzou:	oh
Taro:	Uh my beer is drinking
	drinken by my father
Kenzou:	no!
Taro:	Oh my, oh my beer…
	Finish

****

Kenzo Sato　　　　　　**'Live Concert'**　　　　　　**written English narrative**

My topic is 'a day I will never forget.' My never forget day is last my birthday. My birthday is July 29. The day last summer was Glay's concert GLAY EXPO 2001 GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS. GLAY is my favorite group. It's a four-piece rock band. I like their songs and tones. I had never been to a concert before that day. So I look forward to the coming day. The concert was very exciting. They shoned brilliant performance. At last they sang with all of audience. Of course I sang together. I felt very much. The night I was so excited that I couldn't sleep. I'll never forget the day.

Kenzo Sato   **'Live Concert'**   **spoken English transcription**

Kenzo: My name is Kazuo Sato

My never forget day is

Uh my last birthday

My birthday is July 29th

Uh last my birthday was Glay's concert

Taro: um

Kenzo: um Glay is my favourite groups.

Taro: Really??   {slightly shocked, perhaps disapproving?}

Kenzo: Yeah

Uh it's a four piece rock band

Taro: mm

Kenzo: um I like their songs and

uh songs

Taro: mm

Kenzo: And…

I had never been to their concert the day

Taro: oooh

Kenzo: sooo I look forward to coming the day

Taro: hmm?

Kenzo: uh yeah

And the day

Taro: mm

Kenzo:	uh very clear the sky
Taro:	oh?
Kenzo:	un
	There are very many people
	Uh the concert was started
Taro:	mm
Kenzo:	they um showing brilliant performance
Taro:	mm
Kenzo:	very heavy sounds
Taro:	mm
Kenzo:	and uh beautiful melody
Taro:	mm
Kenzo:	people all standing
Taro:	standing ovation?
Kenzo:	yeah
Taro:	ho ho ho good!
Kenzo:	and…
Taro:	and?
Kenzo:	er at last…
Taro:	hm
Kenzo:	uh they er sing a song together
Taro:	oh
Kenzo:	Glay and er audience
Taro:	uh-huh

Kenzo: singing together

Taro: oh

Kenzo: Of course, my er I singing

Taro: mm

Kenzo: I was very excited

Taro: mm-hm

Kenzo: er that er I was so excited that er I couldn't sleep

Taro: what?

Kenzo: er I never forget the day

Taro: ooh

Kenzo: Thanks, finish.

Ken Kubota   **'The Impudent Woman' Spoken English transcript**

Ken: One day when I took a train

              Uh, there was an impudent woman

              Uh, she was sitting on the seat

              And she was putting her bag and pouch, uh next to here

              And she was reading a newspaper

              I thought how shameless she is

              Uh, an old lady came there

              But she didn't move her bag and pouch

              Uh, uh when the old lady was about to went away

              One man standing, one man was standing and said the old lady

              'Please be seated'

              then she said 'thank you' and sat on the seat

              suddenly the man moved in front of the impudent woman

              and hit her newspaper

              uh she was very surprised

              and he said the woman uh

              'move your bag immediately'

              uh, and she moved the bag and pouch

              and he sat that space

              I was, I thought

              How courageous he is

              Another fellow passenger said nothing but

He expressed himself [clearly, u

Shunta: [hmm

Ken: Hi his behaviour is good example for us to follow

             I show him…honour

             Finish

Shunta: Thank you very much Mr. Kubota, uh did you say your name?

Ken: Uh, sorry my name is Junichi Sugita.

Shunta: Thank you very much, yeah good stuff.

Ken Kubota   **'The Impudent Woman'**   **Spoken Japanese transcript**

Shunta: Please your Japanese story.
Ken: Ok

Aru[11] hi   boku   wa,   [densha ni notteitara
There is day I [male] [topic marker]   train   to had got on {literally had ridden}

Shunta: *[hai*
                                        Yes

Ken: *Boku   wa,   densha ni notteitara   hitori   no*
       I [male] [topic marker] train to had got on   one [person counter]   of

       Hitori no burei na   obasan   ga   imashita
       One   of   rude   of middle-aged woman [subject marker]   there was

Shunta: *Ah, saiyaku   desu   ne*   [that's too bad
          Oh   terrible   [politeness marker]   isn't it   {Shunta's translation of his own comment}

Ken: *[de sono, sono   obasan   wa*
                           And   that,   that   middle-aged woman [topic marker]

       Seki ni suwatteitan   desu   kedo
       Seat   in   sat {literally was seated}   [politeness marker] however

Shunta: *waa-*
          {expression of surprise}

Ken: *tonari ni, jibun   no   nimotsu wo   [wo oiteimashita*
       Next   to   self   [possessive] luggage   [indirect object marker]   [IOM] put down

Shunta: *wao, waau-*
          {expression of surprise}

---

[11] This Japanese transcript was prepared based on a Japanese one which was checked by a native speaker. The English given here is to provide a literal sense of the words to help give readers a sense of the problems faced by Japanese learners of English.

Ken: *moshi sono obasan ga   kono nimotsu wo   dokashite   itara,*
If   that   woman [SM]   this   luggage   [IOM] clear out of the way   [conditional ending]

ato ni san   nin   wa,   suwareteita, to omoun   desu   kedo
,   after 2   3   person [topic M]   could have sat   think   [polite M]   however

Shunta: *waau-*
{expression of surprise}

Ken: *ee,   boku wa,   nanimo sono obasan ni   iwanaide, tatteimashita*
Yeah, I   {topic M},   nothing   that   woman   to   saying not   was standing

Ee, shibaraku   suru   to, densha wa   dandan kondeima [shita
Yeah, a while   happened   and,   train   [topic M]   gradually   become crowded   did

Shunta: *[waau-*
{expression of surprise}

Ken: *aru   eki   de, hitori   no,*
There is   station   at,   one [person counter]   of

Shunta: *nnnn*
Mm {back-channel sound}

Ken: *ihitori no, rou, rouba   ga,   notteikimashita*
One   of   aged   woman   [subject M]   got on

Shunta: *ah –ha {acknowledgement }*

Ken: *rouba   ga   notteikimashita, obaasan   ga   notekimashita*
aged woman   [subject M]   got on,   old lady   [subject M]   got on

Shunta: *Oh!*

79

Ken: *sono obaasan   wa, ee, seki wo   sagashite kitan desu   kedo*

          That   old lady   [topic marker] yeah, seat [IOM] searching came [polite M] however

Shunta: *nnnn*

          Mm {back-channel sound}

Ken: *ee, nimotsu wo oiteita, obasan   ga,   dokasanakatta   node*

          Yeah, luggage   [IOM] put   middle aged woman [subject M] did not move out of the way   so

Shunta: *nn*

          M { short back-channel sound}

Ken: *Chigau sharyou wo   ikou to   shimashita*

          Different carriage   [IDO] intend to go   did

Shunta: *nn, nn, nn*

          Right, right, right

Ken: *soshitara*

          When that happened

       Aru,   otoko no hito   ga   kyu ni   tachiagatte

          There is,   man {lit. 'male person'}   [subject M] suddenly   got up

       Ee, obaa-, sono obaasan ni seki   wo   yuzurimashita

          Yeah, ol- ,   that   old lady   to seat [IOM]   give up {to someone}

Shunta: *nn, nn, nn*

          Right, right, right

Ken: *Obaasan 'arigatou' to iutte, seki ni suwarimashita*

          Old lady   thank you   saying   seat in sat

Shunta: *nn, nn, nn*

          Right, right, right

Ken: *ee,   sou   suru   to,   kono otokono hito   wa,   totsuzen,*
              Yeah   in this way   happen   and   this   man   [topic marker]   suddenly

              Sono, nimotsu wo   oiteita   obasan   no   tokoro ni   itte,
              That   luggage   [IDO]   put down   middle-aged woman   [possessive M]   place   to   went

              Ee,   sono obasan,   wa   shinbun wo   yondeitan   desu   kedo
              Yeah,   that   middle-aged woman,   [topic marker]   newspaper   [IOM]   was reading   [politeness M]   however

              Sono shinbunn wo   omoikiri   tataki otoshimashita
              That   newspaper   [IOM]   as hard as possible   hit   made fall down

Shunta: *nn, nn, nn*
              Right, right, right

Ken: *Soshite, sono obasan ni*
              Then   that   woman   to

              'jama   da,   dokase',   to imashita
              in the way [emphatic]   move   said

Shunta: *nn, nn, nn*
              Right, right, right

Ken: *sou   suru   to, sono   obasan   odoroite*
              In this way   happen   and,   that   middle-aged woman   surprised

              Suguni   nimotsu wo   dokashimashita
              Immediately   luggage   [IOM]   moved

              sou   suru   to,
              In this way   happen   and,

Sono otoko no hito   wa,   sono aita   supeesu ni suwarimashita

That   man   [topic M],   that   free   space   in   sat

Shunta: *nn, nn, nn*

Right, right, right

Ken: *Boku wa,   sono otoko no hito, totemo yuki   no aru hito dana to omoimashita*

I   [topic M],   that   man,   very   courage [possesive] have person isn't it   thought

Shunta: *ummmmmmmmmm*

{intoned sound of understanding and appreciation}

Ken: *etto, hoka no hoka no jokyaku ga,   nani mo ienakatta noni,*

Well,   other   other   passengers [subject M], nothing even   said   but

Sono otoko no hito wa,

That   man   [topic M]

shikari jibun no   iken   wo   tsutaimashita

absolutely   self   [possessive] opinion   [IOM]   communicated

boku wa kare ni keii wo hyoshi mashita

Ken Kubota   'The Impudent Woman'   Spoken Japanese translation

Shunta: Please your Japanese story.

Ken: OK. One day I was riding the train.

Shunta: Yeah.

Ken: I was riding the train and there was a woman, an impudent middle aged woman.

Shunta: Ah, that's terrible isn't it. 'That's too bad' {translating his Japanese to a familiar expression}

Ken: And this, this woman, sat down, but

Shunta: Wow!

Ken: And put down her luggage {on the seat} next to her.

Shunta: Oh, wow!

Ken: If she had moved her luggage out of the way, I think about 2 or 3 more people could have sat down.

Shunta: Wow!

Ken: Yeah, I was standing and didn't say anything. Yeah, and after a while the train became crowded.

Shunta: Wow!

Ken: And at one station…

Shunta: Mmm

Ken: An age-, aged woman got on.

Shunta: ah-ha (laughs)

Ken: An aged woman got on, an aged woman got on.

Shunta: Oh!

Ken: Yeah, the old lady was searching for a seat.

Shunta: Mmm.

Ken: Yeah, the woman with the luggage didn't move it so…

Shunta:	Mm
Ken:	She was about to go to a different carriage.
Shunta:	Right, right, right.
Ken:	Then, a man on the train suddenly stood up, yeah and gave up his seat to the old lady.
Shunta:	Right, right, right.
Ken:	The old lady said 'thanks' and sat in the seat.
Shunta:	Right, right, right
Ken:	Yeah, then all of a sudden, he went over to the woman with the luggage on the seat, yeah and the woman was reading a newspaper, he hit the newspaper full on so that it fell on the floor.
Shunta:	Right, right, right
Ken:	Then he said to her 'it's in the way, move it!'
Shunta:	Right, right, right
Ken:	When he did this the woman was so surprised that she moved her luggage immediately, then the man sat down in the space.
Shunta:	Right, right, right
Ken:	I thought that man was really courageous.
Shunta:	Yeah, really.
Ken:	Well, the other passengers didn't say anything but {I think they all felt} he had made his point.

References

Abrahams, R. D. (1989) 'Black talking on the streets' in Bauman, R. & Sherzer, J. (Eds.)

Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Baerger, D. R. & McAdams, D.P. (1999) 'Life story coherence and its relation to psychological well-being' *Narrative Inquiry.* 9 (1): 69-96.

Bailey, N., Madden, C. & Krashen, S. (1974) 'Is there a "natural sequence" in adult second language learning?' *Language Learning.* 21, 235-243.

Bamburg, M.G.W. (Ed.) (1997a) *Narrative Development: Six Approaches.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

———— (Ed.) (1997b) *Oral Versions of Personal Experience: Three Decades of Narrative Analysis.* special issue of *Journal of Narrative and Life History.* Vol. 7, 1-4. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Barthes, R. (1977) 'Introduction to the structural analysis of narratives' in *Image-Music-Text.* London: Fontana 79-124.

Baugh、A. C. & Cable, T. (1978) *A History of the English Language.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bauman, R. & Sherzer, J. (Eds.) (1989) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking.* (2nd Ed.) Cambridge: CUP.

Beaugrande, R. de. & Colby, B. J. (1979) 'Narrative models of action and interaction' *Cognitive Science.* 3: 43-66. Norwood N.J. : Ablex.

Benedict, R. 1954 *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture.* Tokyo: Tuttle.

Berman, R. A. & Slobin, D. I . (1994) *Relating Events in Narrative: A Crosslinguistic Developmental Study.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Black, J. B. & Wilensky, R. (1979) 'An evaluation of story grammars' *Cognitive Science.* 3: 213-230.

Blight, R. (2002) 'Cultural meanings and conversational implicature' JALT2002 conference. November 22-24. Granship, Shizuoka, Japan.

Brazil, D. (1995) *A Grammar of Speech.* Oxford: OUP.

Brown, R. (1973) *A First Language.* Cambridge, MS: Harvard Press.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983a) *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: CUP.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983b) *Teaching the Spoken Language.* Cambridge: CUP.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1978) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use.* Cambridge: CUP.

Burton, D. (1981) 'Analysing spoken discourse' in Coulthard, M. and Montgomery, M. (Eds.): 61-81.

Bygate, M. (1996) 'Effects of task repetition: appraising the developing language of language learners' in Willis, J. & Willis, D. (Eds.)*Challenge and Change in Language Teaching.* Oxford: Heinemann. 136-146.

Bygate, M., Skehan, P. & Swain, M. (Eds.) (2001) *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing.* Harlow: Pearson Education (Longman).

Cameron, D. (2001) *Working With Spoken Discourse.* London: Sage Publications.

Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. (1995) 'Grammar and the spoken language' *Applied Linguistics,* 16(2): 141-158.

Celce-Murcia, M. and Olshtain, E. (2000) *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: CUP.

Chafe, W. L. (Ed.) (1980) *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production. Advances in Discourse Process Vol. III.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Chalhoub-Deville, M. (2001) 'Task-based assessments: characteristics and validity evidence' in Bygate, M., Skehan, P. and Swain, M. (Eds.): 210-228.

Channell, J. (1994) *Vague Language.* Oxford: OUP.

Cheetham, D. (1998) 'Conversation teaching meets discourse analysis' JALT98

      conference. November 20-23. Omiya, Japan.

Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Christison, N. (1979) 'Natural sequencing in adult second language acquisition' *TESOL*

      Quarterly. 13: 122-127.

Clancy, P. M. (1980) 'Referential choice in narrative discourse' in Chafe, W. L. (ed).

Coates, J. (2003) *Men Talk: Stories in the making of masculinity.* Oxford: Blackwell.

————— (1996) *Women Talk: Conversation between women friends.* Oxford:

      Blackwell.

Coulthard, M. (1985,) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis.* (2ⁿᵈ ed.) Harlow:

      Longman.

————— (Ed.) (1992) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Coulthard, M. & Brazil, D. (1981) 'Exchange structure' in Coulthard, M. &

      Montgomery, M. (Eds.): 82-106.

Coulthard, M. & Montgomery, M. (Eds.) (1981) *Studies in Discourse Analysis.* London

      / NY: Longman.

Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a Global Language.* Cambridge: CUP.

Day, E. M. & Shapson, S. M. (2001) 'Integrating formal and functional approaches to language teaching in French immersion: an experimental study' in Ellis, R. (Ed.): 47-80.

DeKeyser, R.M. (1998) 'Beyond a focus on form: cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing grammar second language grammar' in Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (Eds.): 42-63.

Denning, S. (2000) *The springboard: how story-telling ignites action in knowledge-era organisations.* Boston/Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Di Pietro, R. J. (1987) *Strategic Interaction.* Cambridge: CUP.

Dörnyei, Z. and Thurrell, S. (1994) 'Teaching conversation skills intensively: course content and rationale' *ELT Journal.* 48(1): 40-49.

Doughty, C. (2001) 'Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form' in Robinson, P. (ed.) 206-257.

Doughty, C. and Williams, J. (Eds.) (1998) *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: CUP.

Eggins, S. & Slade, D. (1997) *Analysing Casual Conversation.* London: Cassell.

Ellis, R. (Ed.) (2001) *Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Learning.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Emmott, C. (1999) *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective.* Oxford: OUP.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. & Küntay, A. (1997) 'The occasioning and structure of conversational stories' in Givón, T. (Ed.) *Conversation: Cognitive, Communicative and Social Perspectives.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 133-166.

Fivush, R. (1991) 'The social construction of narratives' *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 37: 59-82.

Foster, P. (1998) 'A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning' *Applied Linguistics.* 19(1): 1-23.

Frances, G. & Hunston, S. (1982) 'Analysing everyday conversation' in Coulthard, M. (Ed.): 123-161

Furo, H. (2001) *Turn-Taking in English and Japanese: Projectability in Grammar, Intonation, and Semantics.* New York: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis.* New York: Harper and Row.

Grice, H. P. (1975) 'Logic and conversation' in Cole P. & Morgan, J. (Eds.) *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts.* NY/SF/ London: Academic Press: 41-58.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies.* Cambridge: CUP.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* (2nd Ed.) NY:

Arnold.

Himbury, S. (2001) 'The future of English education in Japan' in Ainscough, V. & Shiozawa, Y. *English Language Teaching in Japan 2001: Meeting the Challenge.* Yachio: Shumei University: 11-30.

Hinds, J. (1982) *Ellipses in Japanese.* Edmonton, Alberta: Linguistic Research Inc.

Holmes, J. (1997) 'Story-telling in New Zealand women's and men's talk' in Wodak, R. (ed.) *Gender and Discourse.* London: Sage: 263-293.

Hutchby, I. & Wooffit, R. (1998) *Conversation Analysis.* Malden, MA: Polity Press / Blackwell.

Hymes, D. (1972) 'On communicative competence' in Pride, J. B. & Holmes, J. (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings.* Harmondsworth: Penguin: 269-293.

Kasper, G. (2001) 'Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development' *Applied Linguistics.* 22(4): 502-530.

Kenny, T. (2002) 'Teaching pragmatics and stuff in ESL oral classes' presentation at JALT2002 conference. November 22-24. Granship, Shizuoka, Japan.

Kondo, S. (2002) 'Raising pragmatic awareness in the EFL classroom' presentation at JALT2002 conference. November 22-24. Granship, Shizuoka, Japan.

Krashen, S. D. (1987) *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Hemel

Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S.D. & Terrell, T.D. (1988) *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition In the Classroom.* Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Ogborn, J. & Tsatsarelis, C. (2001) *Multimodal Teaching and Learning: the Rhetorics of the Science Classroom.* London/ NY: Continuum.

Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the Inner City.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

——————— (1997) 'Some further steps in narrative analysis' in Bamburg, M. (Ed.) *Oral Versions of Personal Experience: Three Decades of Narrative Analysis* [special issue of the *Journal of Narrative and Life History*]. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum: 395-415.

Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967) 'Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience' in Helms, J. (Ed.) *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts: Proceedings of the 1996 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society.* Seattle: University of Washington Press: 12-44.

Levinson, S. C. (1983) *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: CUP.

——————— (2000) *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of generalized Conversational*

Implicature. Cambridge, MA/London: M. I. T. Press.

Linde, C. (1999) 'The transformation of narrative syntax into institutional memory' *Narrative Inquiry.* 9(1), 139-174. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

LoCastro, V. (1987) '*Aizuchi* a Japanese conversational routine' in Smith, L.E. (Ed.) *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall: 49-65.

Lucantonio, D. (2002) 'Using genre to teach casual conversation' JALT2002 conference. November 22-24. Granship, Shizuoka, Japan.

Mandler, J. M. & Johnson, N. S. (1980) 'On throwing out the baby with the bathwater: a reply to Black and Wilensky's evaluation of story grammars' in *Cognitive Science.* 4: 305-312.

Markee, N. (2000) *Conversation Analysis.* Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Martin, E. E. (1975) *A Reference Grammar of Japanese.* New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

Martin, J.R. (1992) *English Text: System and Structure.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Martin, J.R. & Plum, G. (1997) 'Constructing experience: some story genres' in Bamburg, M. (Ed.) 299-308.

Matsui, T. (2002) 'Semantics & pragmatics of Japanese discourse marker *dakara (so /in other words)*: a unitary account. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 34: 867-891.

Maynard, S. K. (1990) 'Conversation management in contrast: listener response in Japanese and American English' in *Journal of Pragmatics.* 14: 397-412.

McCarthy, M. (1991) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: CUP.

McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (1995) 'Spoken grammar: what is it and how can we teach it' *ELT Journal* 49(3): 207-218 .

——————— (1997) 'Written and spoken vocabulary' in Schmitt, N. & McCarthy, M. (eds.) *Vocabulary Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy.* Cambridge: CUP: 20-39.

Minami, M. (2001) 'Maternal styles of elicitation and development of children's narrative skill: a study of parental scaffolding' *Narrative Inquiry.* 11 (1), 55-80.

Monbusho (1992) *Course of Study Aims.* Tokyo: Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

Nakane, C. (1973) *Japanese Society.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Norrick, N. R. (2000) *Conversational Narrative: Storytelling in Everyday Talk.*

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Norris, J. M., Brown, J. D., Hudson, T. D. & Bonk, W. (2002) 'Examinee abilities and task difficulty in task-based second language performance assessment' in *Language Testing.* Vol. 19 (4): 395-418.

Norris, J. M. & Ortega, L. (2001) 'Does type of instruction make a difference? substantive findings from a meta-analytic review' in Ellis, R. (Ed.): 157-213.

Obana, Y. (2000) *Understanding Japanese: A handbook for learners and Teachers.* Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Ochs, E. & Capps, L. (2001) *Living Narrative: Creating Lives in Everyday Storytelling.* Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.

Overstreet, M. (1999) *Whales, Candlelight, and Stuff Like That: General Extenders in English Discourse.* NY/Oxford: 1999.

Paltridge, B. (2001) *'Genre and the Language Learning Classroom.* Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Peterson, C., Jesso, B. & McCabe, A. (1999) 'Encouraging narratives in preschoolers: an intervention study' in *Journal of Child Language.* 26: 49-67.

Peterson, C. & McCabe, A. (1983) *Developmental Psycholinguistics: Three Ways of*

Looking at a Child's Narrative. NY/London: Plenum Press.

Prabhu, N. (1987) *Second Language Pedagogy.* Oxford: OUP.

Polanyi, L. (1985) *Telling the American Story: A Structural and Cultural Analysis of Conversational Storytelling.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Propp, V. (1968) *Morphology of the Folktale.* Austin: University of Texas.

Reisman, K. (1989) 'Contrapuntal conversations in an Antiguan village' in Bauman, R. & Sherzer, J. (Eds.)

Robinson, P. (2001) 'Task complexity, cognitive resources, and syllabus design: a triadic framework for examining task influences on SLA' in Robinson, P. (ed.) 183-205.

Robinson, P. (ed.) (2001) *Cognition in Second Language Instruction.* Cambridge: CUP.

Rose, K. R. & Kasper, G. (2001) *Pragmatics and Language Teaching.* Cambridge: CUP.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1977) 'Understanding and summarizing brief stories' in LaBerge, D. & Samuels, S.J. (Eds.) *Basic Processes in reading: Perception and Comprehension.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

———— (1980) 'On evaluating story grammars' in *Cognitive Science.* 4: 313-316.

Sacks, H. (1995) *Lectures on Conversation: Volumes 1 & 2.* (One volume ed.) Oxford:

Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation' *Language.* 50: 696-735.

Sato, K. (2002) 'Practical understandings of communicative language teaching in and teacher development' in Savignon, S. J. (Ed.): 41-81.

Savignon, S. J. (ed.) (2002) *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education.* New Haven / London: Yale University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1988) *Discourse Markers.* Cambridge: CUP.

————— (1996) 'Narrative as self-portrait: Sociolinguistic constructions of identity' *Language in Society.* 25: 167-203.

Schank, R. C. (1984) *The Cognitive Computer.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge: CUP.

————— (2002) *Consciousness and Language.* Cambridge: CUP.

Sinclair, J. (1992) 'Priorities in discourse analysis' in Coulthard, M. (Ed.) 79-88.

Skehan, P. (1996) 'A framework for the implementation of task based instruction' in *Applied Linguistics.* 17: 38-62.

——— (1998) *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning.* Oxford: OUP.

——— (2001) 'Tasks and language performance assessment' in Bygate, M. Skehan, P. & Swain, M. (Eds.): 167-185.

Skehan, P. & Foster, P. (1999) 'The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings' in *Language Learning.* 49(1): 93-120.

———— (2001) 'Cognition and Tasks' in Robinson, P. (Ed.): 183-205.

Stubbs, M. (1983) *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Swain, M. (1998) 'Focus on form through conscious reflection' in Doughty, C. & Williams, J. 64-81.

Tanaka, H. (1999) *Turn-Taking in Japanese Conversation: A Study in Grammar and Interaction.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tannen, D. (1989) *Talking Voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge: CUP.

Thorndyke, P. W. (1977) 'Cognitive Structures in Comprehension and Memory of Narrative Discourse' in *Cognitive Psychology.* 9: 77-110.

Toolan, M. (2001) *Narrative: a critical linguistic introduction.* (2nd Ed.) London / NY: Routledge.

Tsui, A.B.M. (1994) *English Conversation.* Cambridge: CUP.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986) [Russian original: 1934] *Thought and Language.* Cambridge, MA / London. M. I. T. Press.

Wada, M. (2002) 'Teacher education for curricular innovation in Japan' in S. J. Savignon, S. J. (Ed.): 31-40.

Watanabe, S. (1993) 'Cultural Differences in Framing' in Tannen D. (Ed.) *Framing in Discourse.* Oxford: OUP: 176-209.

Williams, J & Evans, J. (1998) 'What kind of focus and on which forms?' in Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (Eds.): 139-155.

Wolfson, N. (1978) 'A feature of performed narrative: the conversational historical present' in *Language and Society.* 7: 215-237.

——— (1979) 'The conversational historical present alternation' in *Language.* 55(1): 160-182.

——— (1982a) *CHP The Conversational Historical Present in American English Narrative.* Dordrecht, Holland / Cinnaminson, USA: Foris Publications.

——— (1982b) 'On tense alteration and the need for analysis of native speaker usage in second language acquisition' in *Language Learning.* 32(1): 53-68.

Woodward, T. (1996) 'Paradigmatic shift and the language teaching profession' in Willis, J. & Willis, D. (Eds.) *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching.* Oxford: Heinemann: 4-9.

Yamada, H. (1997) *Different Games, Different Rules: Why Americans and Japanese*

Misunderstand Each Other. Oxford: OUP.